DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 075 UD 022 261

AUTHOR Eyler, Janet; And Others
TITLE Resegregation: Segregation within Desegregated Schools.
INSTITUTION Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville, Tenn.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 82
CONTRACT 300-79-0403
NOTE 80p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March, 1982). Prepared at the Institute for Public Policy Studies.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Ability Grouping; Bilingual Education; Compensatory Education; *Desegregation Methods; Elementary Secondary Education; *Homogeneous Grouping; Literature Reviews; Minority Group Children; *Racial Segregation; *School Desegregation; *School Resegregation; Special Education; Student Evaluation; Suspension; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Resegregation is the process by which students are separated into racially or ethnically isolated groups within desegregated schools. Resegregation may result from the traditional practice of sorting students into apparently homogeneous groups through ability grouping and tracking and through student selection for compensatory education, special education, and bilingual education. The degree to which these practices enhance resegregation is determined by: student assignment procedures that overrepresent minority children in lower academic groupings and underrepresent them in higher academic groupings; minority overrepresentation in school enrollment; the practice of pulling children out of the regular classroom; and the extent to which individual children have multiple eligibility, or qualify for several categorical programs. Discipline practices characterized by the disproportionate suspension of black students also contribute to resegregation. To reduce within-school resegregation, schools must adopt alternatives in current practices. Assessment for student grouping should be based on different kinds of information and should be properly interpreted, instruction should be organized to encourage integration among heterogeneous student groups, and discipline methods should emphasize keeping students in school rather than suspending them. Finally, more research is needed for further progress in reducing resegregation. (Author/MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216075

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Janet Eyler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RESEGREGATION: SEGREGATION WITHIN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

Janet Eyler, Valerie Cook, Leslie Ward

UD 022 261

*This study is supported under U.S. Department of Education Contract No. 300-79-0403. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent positions or policies of the department.

ABSTRACT

Resegregation: Segregation Within Desegregated Schools

JANET EYLER - Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies

VALERIE COOK - Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies

LESLIE WARD - Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies

Resegregation is the process by which students are separated into racially or ethnically isolated settings within schools that are desegregated.

This paper (1) provides a background for understanding the process of resegregation, (2) presents evidence showing how current educational practices resegregate, and (3) identifies and describes non-resegregative alternatives to traditional assessment, instructional, regulatory and discipline practices.

The analysis is based on a comprehensive review of the empirical literature relating ability grouping and tracking, special education, bilingual programs, federal compensatory programs, testing and assessment, discipline practices and instructional strategies to racially/ethnically diverse students.

RESEGREGATION: SEGREGATION WITHIN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

Janet Eyler

Valerie Cook

Leslie Ward

Resegregation: Definition and Background

> Because school desegregation is often preceded by years of litigation and controversy about the creation of racially or ethnically mixed schools, it is all too easy to think of desegregation in its narrowest sense and to assume that once racially mixed schools have been set up the desegregation process is complete. However, it is crucial to recognize that it is precisely at this point in the desegregation process that interracial schooling begins for the students and that the nature of the students' experiences is crucial to their academic and social development. (Hawley, Crain, Rossell, Fernandez, Schofield, Smylie, Tompkins, Trent, & Zlotnik, 1981, p. 81.)

This report focuses on what happens within schools after the school bus has arrived. Specifically, this study examines how the resegregation of students within desegregated schools occurs; identifies currently available alternatives to minimize it; and suggests directions for future research and development to meet this problem.

Within-school resegregation refers to the separation of children by race/ethnicity within the walls of the desegregated school. Resegregation is a major threat to desegregation in that it reestablishes racial isolation presumably eliminated by the reassignment of students from school to school. Among its other consequences, resegregation undermines the possibility for interracial/ethnic contact and equal status interactions, potentially limiting minority student achievement.

The problem of resegregation is extensive and pervasive. In an analysis of 1976 Office of Civil Rights (OCR) data, Morgan and McPartland (1980) found that while racial segregation was primarily due to segregated schools, resegregation played an important role in contributing to racial isolation in education. They noted:

> . . . majority white desegregated schools--which comprise about three-quarters of all desegregated schools and enroll about half of all black students attending desegregated schools--seem especially prone to ex-

> treme classroom resegregation. For example, at the high school level, predominantly black and entirely white classes are found in majority white schools at several times the rate that would be expected by chance. These patterns are most pronounced in the South and at the secondary school level where school desegregation has been reported to be better accomplished than other regions or levels. In other words, when black students find a greater chance of school desegregation they are also likely to find a somewhat greater chance of classroom resegregation.

There are several sources of resegregation in schools. The first, and most important, is the traditional response of schools to student diversity. Students are sorted and categorized and programs matched to their apparent needs. Behavioral standards are adopted to reduce diversity and students who do not conform are excluded. To the extent that race and ethnicity are associated with criteria used to sort or exclude students, these processes will result in racial imbalance of classes and racial disproportionality in exclusion. Resegregation results. This process may be allowed to continue because school officials perceive a conflict between the goal of integration and other goals within the school setting and choose to resegregate because they think it is necessary to attain the highest possible levels of achievement for each child. The traditional practice of sorting students into apparently homogeneous groups may also continue because of a lack of administrative and instructional resources for effectively organizing schools in a different way for instruction.

Sarason (1971, p. 3) notes that: ". . . any attempt to introduce a change into the school involves some existing regularity, behavioral or programmatic." The paradox of desegregation may be that it often reinforces the traditional programmatic and behavioral regularities of schools which have the consequence of resegregating students within schools. Because desegregation requires comprehensive changes, it increases the complexity, uncertainty, and diversity with which school personnel must cope. These demands frequently overload the professional capabilities and the capacity for ambiguity that teachers and administrators possess. The need for reduction of that overload typically leads to a search for clarity and simplification that manifests itself in

classifications, programs, and routines which are resegregative. In short, the demands for change brought about by desegregation result in the perpetuation or revival of the traditional responses of schools to diversity--such as the forming of homogeneous groups and the adoption of behavioral standards that reduce diversity--which, de facto, increase racial isolation.

A second source of the resegregation of students may be found in the fragmented public policymaking process. While courts and some agencies may be making policies which mandate or facilitate integration, other agencies may develop programs which seem at cross-purposes with integration. Just as the government supports both tobacco crops and warnings on cigarette packages, public policy about education is made in a variety of decision-making arenas. They respond to different groups and different interests which ultimately may conflict. For example, categorical aid programs which require or allow disadvantaged students to be removed from the classroom for compensatory services will have a resegregative effect. Bilingual programs may be difficult to staff and run if students with limited English proficiency are scattered through a district as the result of a desegregation plan and thus they may be clustered into certain schools and receive most of their instruction in segregated settings.

A third source of resegregation practices may be found in racism or in the inability of individuals within the school system to deal with cultural differences in a sensitive way. This may result at its harshest in blatant attempts to segregate minority students into particular classrooms or tracks. Or school personnel may have preconceptions about the abilities of minority students that increase the likelihood that these students will be classified into lower tracks. Or they may sort students into bilingual classes by ethnicity rather than language facility. Such insensitivity may extend to misperceptions of cultural behavior which causes students to be punished or suspended

from school disproportionately by race or ethnicity.

The first and second of these sources of resegregative practices are benign in their intent. But by focusing on some legitimate educational goals to the exclusion of concern about wider impact, these approaches to targeting educational services have a negative impact on desegregation. The consequences of resegregation within the school are to destroy the potential for equal status contact between members of different racial and ethnic groups and to deny students exposure to similar educational expectations and experiences. Resegregation thus impedes the basic goals of school desegregation: the elimination of racial stereotypes and prejudice; minority achievement; and, perhaps, the subsequent opportunities of minorities for economic success later in life.

The next section of this paper will focus on the traditional responses of schools to diversity, that is the academic/programmatic and social/behavioral regularities which have collided with desegregation. This includes the academic practices of ability grouping and tracking, compensatory educational services, special education and bilingual education, and discipline practices which lead to exclusion of students from school. Discussion of these practices will include a description of the practice and assessment of its resegregative effect, evaluation of the relationship of the practice to desegregation, and a description of the effectiveness of the practice and rationale for its continuance. Other sources of resegregation, that is, insensitivity and fragmented public policymaking processes, will be discussed, where appropriate, within the context of these traditional practices.

Subsequent sections of the paper will first note alternative strategies for pupil assessment, service delivery, instruction and discipline with potential for reducing resegregation, and then identify critical needs for further research development.

Resegregation as a Result of Assignment to Academic Programs

One set of policies and practices that can lead to resegregation are those related to the assignment or selection of academic programs. Schools typically sort students into homogeneous groups for instruction and these instructional groupings often entail different educational goals. The process by which such selection occurs includes use of a mix of objective and subjective criteria including standardized testing, recommendations of teachers, counselors, and other school personnel, and parent and student choice. The reasons for a student being in a particular program are complex, the research limited, but a clear outcome of the drive for homogeneity of instruction is resegregation. There are several dimensions of student diversity and a variety of grouping practices are used to attempt to address these differences. These include several forms of ability grouping, tracking, and remedial programs for students thought to be in the wide normal range of ability; a variety of special education programs for handicapped students, and several ways of organizing instruction in bilingual education programs for students with limited English proficiency (LEP).

Ability Grouping and Tracking

Resegregation Through Ability Grouping and Tracking

Ability grouping and tracking are the primary methods for separating students into homogeneous groups and thus a major force for resegregation. Ability grouping may refer to the practice of assigning students to separate classrooms on the basis of some assessment of their "abilities" or to similar within-class groupings of students. When these ability groups are rigid and students take all their subjects in a high or low group, students are sometimes said to be "tracked." In this paper, "tracking" refers more narrowly to differentiated curricula for secondary students; schools usually offer college preparatory, general, and vocational tracks. In high school the practice of tracking and

ability grouping are often combined, resulting, for example, in honors, regular, and remedial sections of courses within the various tracks. Required core courses that might allow integration of students in different tracks may also be ability grouped and correspond with track enrollment.

Elementary schools. Ability grouping by class and/or within class is pervasive throughout the student's educational career in public schools. Studies from across the country report anywhere from 46 to 77 percent of schools assigning elementary students to classrooms by assessment of ability (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974; Findley & Bryan, 1975; Mills & Bryan, 1976; Tompkins, 1978; Epstein, 1980). Within classrooms, assessment of reading ability is usually the basis for grouping that may extend to other classroom activities (Haller, 1981). In one study, 84% of the 886 elementary teachers questioned used ability grouping within their classrooms and those few teachers who chose not to use it had classes that they perceived to be relatively homogeneous (Epstein, 1980).

Ability grouping tends to segregate children by race and social class with disproportionately more poor and minority children in lower levels and disproportionately more affluent and white children in higher levels (Findley & Bryan, 1971; Esposito, 1971; Goldberg, Passow, & Justman, 1966; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974; Green & Griffore, 1978). As long as the well-documented relationship between typically used measures of ability and race obtains, any desegregated school system that uses ability grouping extensively is likely to have high levels of resegregation.

The resegregation that occurs through ability grouping is exacerbated by the apparent rigidity of grouping assignments. There is little chance for students to be promoted once assigned to a level (Epstein, 1980; Green & Griffore, 1978). Early decisions, made perhaps as early as kindergarten (Rist, 1970) may channel students permanently and result in track placement when they enter

secondary school.

The ability of students to catch up when their initial low ability grouping results from academic inexperience or misperception by the teacher is likely to be restricted by the scope of the educational program for the slow group as well as by the rigidity of the system. Less time and attention appears to be spent with those perceived to be less able (Rist, 1970; Oakes, 1980); a poorer curriculum may be provided for lower groups (Green & Griffore, 1978); and there is little evidence of differential instruction tailored to help students in slow groups meet the instructional goals of the schools (Froman, 1981). It appears that different educational goals have been established for these groups. The differences in achievement that result from these elementary groupings will be used to track students into high school programs with explicitly different educational goals.

Secondary schools. American comprehensive high schools generally offer a differentiated curriculum for students. Track selection, usually made in grades 9 or 10, is based upon achievement, student (and perhaps parent) preference, counselor or teacher recommendations, and program availability. Tracking is related to ability grouping practices in that children in high ability groups generally choose or are assigned to a college preparatory curriculum over general or vocational tracks, and low ability group children choose or are assigned to vocational and general tracks more frequently than college preparatory tracks.

High tracking practices lead to extensive resegregation with black students disproportionately overrepresented in vocational or general tracks and underrepresented in college preparatory tracks (Harnischfeger & Wiley, 1980; Larkins & Oldham, 1976). Hispanic students are also overrepresented in low ability tracks (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974) which may be more prevalent in schools with a substantial Hispanic population (Carter & Segura, 1979).

There is also some evidence that different racial patterns exist within the vocational track, with black females likely to be highly concentrated in home-making and consumer programs (Wulfsberg, 1980; Green & Cohen, 1979).

Tracking has also been found to have spillover effects on scheduling of common courses and electives, and on non-curriculum aspects of the school program so that resegregation occurs where it is not necessitated by track placement further limiting opportunities for interracial contact (Larkins & Oldham, 1976; Green & Cohen, 1979).

The Relationship of Tracking and Ability Grouping to Desegregation

There is no evidence specifically linking tracking and ability grouping practices to implementation of desegregation plans. It is not known if use of tracking or minority assignment to vocational and general tracks has increased, decreased, or stayed the same in districts where desegregation has been carried out. Intensive interviews of professionals in 18 school districts undergoing court ordered desegregation suggest, however, that resegregation has occurred within most schools undergoing desegregation, with ability grouping and tracking generally noted as the cause (Trent, 1981).

There is also evidence to suggest that the use of rigid grouping or tracking practices is related to the racial composition and perceived heterogeneity of the student body and to teacher attitudes about integration. Maximum resegregation occurs in schools that are racially balanced (Morgan & McPartland, 1980) and use of tracking increases as the proportion of black students rises (Epstein, 1980).

Low teacher support for integration has been associated with tracking and the use of rigid ability grouping within classes, and with selection of compensatory programs to assist low achieving students. Low teacher prejudice is associated with use of classroom techniques that facilitate interracial contact (Epstein, 1980; Gerard & Miller, 1976). Professional judgments may

be influenced by class or race bias. The selection of rigid tracking and grouping procedures is itself associated with negative attitudes towards integration.

The Persistence of Ability Grouping and Tracking

In spite of the evidence that tracking and grouping resegregates students there is considerable professional resistance to relinquish the practice. Historically, ability grouping and tracking have dominated school organization in the U.S. and elsewhere in the world. The practices enjoy tremendous support from school professionals (National Education Association, 1968) who find it administratively convenient, consistent with the value of maximizing individual achievement, and necessary for the group instructional methods commonly in use in the schools. Support for homogeneous grouping is apparently rooted in the belief that it is the best choice for meeting the learning needs of students of diverse academic backgrounds.

The view that students are best taught in homogeneous groups is not supported by several decades of research ability grouping. This is particularly true if the following criteria are used for evaluation: (1) cognitive achievement, (2) affective outcomes, and (3) equity.

Froman (1981) conducted an extensive review of the ability grouping literature and drew a number of conclusions which are consistent with the views of others who have surveyed this field (e.g., Esposito, 1971; Findley & Bryan, 1975; Goldberg, Passow, & Justman, 1966). There is some evidence that high ability students may benefit in cognitive achievement from tracking, but no evidence that it benefits middle groups, and low groups tend to fall behind. Interestingly, the positive evidence tends to be found in early studies and not in later, better controlled studies (Froman, 1981). In contrast, there is some evidence that low and average students make cognitive gains in heterogeneous classes (Marascuilo & McSweeny, 1972).

Tracking also has a negative effect on the self-esteem of lower groups and may inflate the self-regard of high groups (Froman, 1981). While the association of self-esteem with achievement is not well understood, a system which leaves many students with low self-regard which does not clearly promote achievement can be questioned. This is particularly true since it leads to resegregation, making the interracial contact sought as one goal of integration less possible.

The persistence of tracking and ability grouping in spite of evidence of their lack of effectiveness and their clear resegregatory effects in desegregated schools may result partly from a lack of skills and resources of school personnel for coping with heterogeneous groups of students. Teachers have few resources for instructing students with techniques that work well with heterogeneous groups; and there is evidence that they may be less successful when they face highly diverse student bodies equipped with traditional instructional techniques (Evertson, Sanford, & Emmer, 1981).

It is also administratively simpler to divide a school or classroom into groups and deliver all services to students in those groups. Homogeneous grouping that may be useful for one learning task then extends to experiences which could be as effective with heterogeneous groups. At the school level, administrative ease sometimes leads to tracking based on compensatory program delivery (Kimbrough & Hill, 1981).

In summary, teachers and administrators persist in support of homogeneous grouping in spite of (1) its clear resegregative impact, and (2) considerable evidence to suggest that it is likely to result in lower achievement for low and average students and little evidence to support its utility for high ability students. The continuing use of these techniques may result from the lack of instructional and organizational resources for dealing with heterogeneous groups of students. The association of attitudes about integration

with the choice of rigid tracking also suggests that the resegregative effect of ability grouping and tracking may not always be incidental to other educational goals.

Compensatory Education Programs

Resegregation Through Compensatory Education Programs

Numerous federal and state education programs have been enacted in the past two decades in the interest of increasing the equality of educational benefit for various populations. By both judicial and legislative action, provision of remedial or compensatory educational services has been required for poor and low-achieving children and children in minority-isolated and recently desegregated schools. Two significant programs were: Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) which distributes funds to school districts for the provision of compensatory services to economically and educationally disadvantaged children; and the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) which provided assistance to school districts for purposes related to implementing desegregation and overcoming minority group isolation.

In addition to these federally mandated programs, at least 12 states operate their own compensatory education (CE) programs. The federal programs themselves have several offshoots for particular groups of disadvantaged children in addition to their major provisions. ESEA, for example, funds separate programs for children of migrant workers.

There is disproportionate minority student participation in compensatory education programs. ESAA, by its very definition, was intended to serve the needs of these students. Blacks, Hispanos, and other minority students are represented to a greater degree in the low-income and low-achieving categories, and consequently among Title I selectees, than are white students. However, this overrepresentation is not solely the result of disproportionate poverty and low achievement. Within categories of economic status and educational

performance, greater percentages of minority students than of whites are selected for Title I (Breglio, Hinkley, & Beal, 1978).

Student "pullout" is the dominant method of delivering Title I services. It has been estimated that 75% of compensatory aid removes the child from the regular classroom and for about one-third of those involved in pullout programs, all instruction takes place in settings with other CE students (Poynor, 1977). There is also evidence of substantial use of pullout in ESAA (Wellisch 1979) and state-funded compensatory programs (Brookover, Brady, & Warfield, 1981).

The average student receiving compensatory education spends about one-fourth of total available learning time in the program. Students in pullout programs miss regular instruction in a variety of subject areas, not infrequently in those that are targeted for remediation such as reading or math (National Institute of Education (NIE), 1976; Brookover et al., 1981; Kimbrough & Hill, 1981).

Pullout results in resegregation. Minority students receive above-average hours of compensatory reading and math instruction delivered in small groups by special teachers. Students are typically pulled out from less to more segregated settings (Hinkley, Beal, & Breglio, 1978; Kimbrough & Hill, 1981; Brookover et al., 1981).

The Relationship of Compensatory Programs to Desegregation

Several authors have noted an inherent tension between compensatory education and integrated education as strategies for increasing equality of educational opportunity. Compensation is seen as requiring the concentration of disadvantaged students for intensive remedial treatment, while integration relies on the dispersion of minority students among their more advantaged peers and in schools of better quality (Levin, 1978; Radin, 1978). This conflict has been observed especially with regard to the operation of Title I programs

in desegregating school systems, where students and schools may lose services due to changing patterns of attendance imposed by desegregation plans (Berke & Demarest, 1978: Thiemann & Deflaminis, 1978). This situation was ameliorated by changes in Title I eligibility criteria for students affected by desegregation, and by the use of ESAA funds for compensatory education for schools and students who lose Title I eligibility due to desegregation (NIE, 1977; Hawley & Barry, 1980). The point remains, however, that direct service compensatory programs may be difficult to implement simultaneously with desegregation without resulting in resegregation. The potential for resegregation through compensatory services is exacerbated in schools that operate several categorical programs and have substantial numbers of students who are eligible for more than one type of service. Typically, these schools place multiple eligible children in every program for which they qualify, resulting in numerous pullouts or, in some cases, the establishment of a separate track based on compensatory program participation (Kimbrough & Hill, 1981).

The Persistence of Compensatory Education as an Instructional Approach

Why do school systems rely on pullout, a resegregative technique, for delivery of such compensatory services? As long as minority group students are disproportionately counted among the recipients of compensatory and other categorical services, pullout will result in a degree of resegregation. Whether or not this trade-off between compensation and integration is justified depends to no small extent on the educational efficacy of pullout programs. The most appropriate conclusion to draw from the available research on this point is that pullout has not been supported on achievement grounds, and mainstream approaches to compensatory education have not been adequately evaluated (Rossi, McLaughlin, Campbell, & Everett, 1977; Poynor, 1977). In any event, the impact of pullout on achievement does not appear to offset its resegregative effects.

If the educational efficacy of pullout does not provide an adequate rationale for its widespread use, what accounts for its predominance in Title I and other categorical programs? While neither the legislation nor the regulations stipulate the setting in which services are to be delivered, there are several requirements that make pullout seem the obvious way to achieve compliance:

1. Title I funds must not be co-mingled with other revenue sources, but rather spent on identifiable services.
2. The services must be provided only to the identified, eligible students within a school (usually not all eligible students are served, due to the concentration requirement).
3. The services must "supplement, not supplant" the regular services provided to all students.

These provisions require that Title I provide a recognizable program for targeted students that is in addition to the regular school program. The easiest way for schools to do this has been to separate Title I students from others for the compensatory services (Glass & Smith, 1977; Brookover et al., 1981). Recent changes in the law may facilitate regulation changes to ameliorate this problem.

In summary, compensatory programs are primarily designed to assist poor and low achieving children. As minority children are disproportionately represented in these groups, they are also disproportionately represented in compensatory programs. Since most compensatory aid is administered by pulling children out of regular classes for special instruction, the impact is to resegregate. Children in pullout programs spend a significant amount of time in more racially isolated settings; a substantial proportion have all their classes with other CE students. The resegregative effect of compensatory

services are difficult to avoid because of a lack of alternative models and resources for service delivery and because of the need to adhere to federal regulations about targeting aid.

Special Education

Resegregation Through Special Education

The provision of special education is based on the right to an education for all American children, including the handicapped. It has been assumed that because handicapped children have special needs, special materials, instructional methods, and specially trained teachers are needed. These special services have generally been provided by grouping students according to their handicapping condition. Assignment to a special education class is usually based on a combination of standardized test results, subjective evaluations of school personnel, and parental consent. Because minority children are likely to perform at a lower level on standardized tests than do white children and are likely, as a group, to be more negatively perceived, they tend to be overrepresented in special classrooms, especially those for the mildly retarded.

Passage of Public Law 94-142, the Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975, culminated a decade of court decision and laws designed to establish the right to an appropriate education for handicapped children. Provisions requiring non-discriminatory assessment and placement in the least restrictive environment (LRE) are the most important components of the law with implications for racial and ethnic segregation in special education. The legislative history of P.L. 94-142 indicates that the issues affecting minority group children were not the major concern of the dominant advocate groups. Rather, emphasis was on the inclusion in public education of children who had historically been barred from school, the more severely handicapped.

The more severe or more obvious handicapping conditions are fairly easily

discernible. These include severe emotional disturbance, trainably and severely mentally retarded (TMR and SMR), and speech and physical handicaps. It is in the differentiations of the mildly handicapping conditions, educably mentally retarded (EMR) and learning disabled (LD), which rely heavily on judgments of school personnel, that questions of resegregation arise.

While the regular curriculum is organized in ways that lead to resegregation, there is an even more dramatic tendency for special education programs to become ghettos for black children. The great disproportionality of black youngsters in special education classes, particularly the most stigmatizing educational EMR classes has been amply documented (Children's Defense Fund, 1974; Cook, 1980; Columbus Public Schools, 1980; Center for National Policy Review, 1980). The resegregative impact of this pattern is mitigated only by the comparatively small percentages of youngsters involved. Whereas most children will be affected by school policies related to ability grouping and tracking, nationally about 5.9% of white students, 5.8% of Hispanos, and about 8.4% of black students are assigned to all categories of special education. The figures for EMR assignment are about 1% of whites, 1% of Hispanos, and 3.5% of blacks. There are also substantial regional variations with the greatest disproportion of placements of black children in EMR settings found in the South (Center for National Policy Review, 1980).

There is a good deal of evidence to suggest a dramatic decline during the past decade in the overrepresentation of Hispanic students in EMR classes. Early 1970s data on Hispanic enrollment in EMR classes showed substantial disproportionality; this was most dramatic in districts serving large numbers of Hispanic students (Carter, 1970a; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974). More recent reports show Hispanic enrollments in EMR classes approximating those of Caucasian students, although there is still a tendency towards over-

representation in district with substantial Hispanic enrollment (Aspira, 1979b; Carter & Segura, 1979; Center for National Policy Review, 1980).

The disproportionate representation of minorities in learning disability (LD) classes is not nearly so dramatic as for EMR classes. Nationally black students were slightly less likely to be categorized as LD and dramatically less so in the Northeast and Midwest. In contrast, Hispanos tend to be slightly overrepresented in classes for LD nationally (Aspira, 1979b; Center for National Policy Review, 1980).

Since LD classification is generally conceived to be less stigmatizing than EMR to children so labeled, the disproportionate number of black students assigned to the more stigmatizing program raises some serious questions about the evaluation and assignment of black children in special education classes. The decline in the proportion of Hispanic children in EMR classes may reflect a change in assessment procedures which eliminates the obviously unfair technique of testing a Spanish-speaking child with an English IQ test. Their slight overrepresentation in LD classes may reflect ambiguity in the definition of LD, especially as it relates to the understanding of the impact of having Spanish as a first language in a predominantly English-speaking educational system. The movement of minority children out of special education does not necessarily reduce the overall resegregation of these children within the school; they may be moved out of EMR classes into a largely segregated low ability group class or into equally segregated bilingual education programs.

The extent to which categorizing minority children as EMR or LD will result in resegregation depends on the organization of special service delivery. In practice, the options of placement generally available in schools are, from the least restrictive to the most restrictive: resource room service, part-time special class, full-time special class, and special day school. Resource

room services are often limited in scope, for example, some school districts allow a maximum of one hour per day of resource help. Children classified as EMR are generally placed in full-time special classes. Children classified as LD may receive resource help or full-time placement, depending on the perceived severity of the learning disability.

The Relationship of Special Education Programs to Desegregation

For a number of reasons, it is difficult to determine if special education assignments for black children have increased with desegregation. Are such assignments being used systematically to resegregate within desegregated schools? One problem is that data on special education by race was not systematically gathered nationally before 1973. In the South, where disproportionate assignment is greatest, desegregation preceded this period. In the past decade there has been increased attention given to special education programs and provision of additional resources for special education, and this has in many cases coincided with the process of desegregation. In school districts where an increase in special education placement occurred simultaneously with desegregation, it is difficult to determine the extent to which this is in response to desegregation or a response to an increased focus on special education assignment. This is especially true when there is no racial data preceding desegregation.

There is some evidence that special education assignment for black children may increase immediately after busing to integrate, that it may be a specific response to desegregation. Some school districts have experienced an immediate increase of referrals for special education evaluation of black children bused to previously white schools (Galusha, 1980; Watkins, 1980; Columbus Public Schools, 1979, 1980, 1981).

The Persistence of Special Education as an Approach to Service Delivery

The resegregation of minority children through full-time placement of these children in special education classes (especially EMR) calls to question the effectiveness of this organizational practice. Researchers studying the effectiveness of differing organizations of service delivery in special education have generally compared the effectiveness of special classes to mainstreaming of EMR children. Several excellent reviews are available which conclude that researchers have failed to show a difference in achievement of students placed in full-time EMR classes and those who have been mainstreamed (Abramson, 1980; Corman & Gottlieb, 1978; Semmel, Gottlieb, & Robinson, 1979).

If special classes are not effective, then why do schools persist in this organization? The range of diversity which teachers encounter with mainstreamed EMR students is very great. There are very real, and educationally important, differences between the child with an IQ of 60 (EMR range) and the child with an IQ of 140 (gifted range). The regular teacher may not have the knowledge or technical facilities which would support an appropriate educational program for these children. Furthermore, special classes are the administratively easiest means by which to provide services to groups of children which had not been routinely served by the school.

Although P.L. 94-142, the Education for all Handicapped Children Act, mandates placement in the least restrictive environment (LRE) appropriate to the child's development, in the early years of implementation of P.L. 94-142 state education departments and local school districts were primarily concerned with the identification of eligible children and the establishment of LEP and due process procedures (Hargrove, Graham, Ward, Abernethy, Cunningham, & Vaughn, 1981; Stearns, Green, & David, 1980). Implementing the LRE provision has received less attention and professionals have not received the technical support necessary to achieve this goal.

Resegregation Through Bilingual Education

Bilingual education programs are based on the value of equal benefit from educational opportunities. Given equal access to English-based instruction, the limited-English proficient (LEP) student does not have the same opportunity for learning as do English proficient students. The magnitude of the need for bilingual education is difficult to gauge, since there are no accurate counts of the number of LEP children (Thernstrom, 1980), and there are varying degrees of language proficiency in both languages of LEP children (Alexander & Nana, 1977). The majority of students in need of bilingual education are Hispanic, though a significant proportion of Hispanic children who need special language services are not enrolled in such programs (Aspira, 1979b; Department of Education, 1980; Fernandez & Guskin, 1981). "Indeed, among the 12 states where the need for bilingual programs is the greatest, only one-third to two-thirds of the Hispanic children are being served" (Fernandez & Guskin, 1981). Though bilingual programs are not reaching all of those children needing services, those children who do participate tend to find bilingual programs segregative experiences (Kimbrough & Hill, 1981).

There is very little reliable data on characteristics of students in bilingual education programs or on the ways in which programs are organized and services delivered. Thus, the conclusion that bilingual education is resegregative is based on limited data and consideration of the organization of bilingual education programs.

The resegregative impact of a bilingual program will depend on the goals for the program and its instructional focus. Policy makers have generally mandated transitional programs designed to prepare LEP students to learn effectively in the regular school program. Many proponents of bilingual education espouse a desire for maintenance programs to develop equal competence

in both languages as well as fostering a bicultural identity. The resegregative impact of a maintenance orientation might be softened if English-speaking students were active participants and developed proficiency in the second language; this would create a two-way rather than one-way program. In such programs, children who were initially monolingual in English would have the advantage of bilingual competency. The programs would be viewed as "alternative" rather than "remedial." However, few two-way programs exist.

Programs with the goal of transition are generally one-way and are an English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) strategy. The basis of ESL is that of teaching English as a foreign language (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1972), to assist the LEP child in gaining the English language proficiency necessary to have a successful educational experience. While ESL classes are segregated, they may separate the children from their English-speaking peers for only part of the day. If transition to regular classes is implemented, then they may not, in the long run, be resegregative. About half of bilingual programs use this model (Aspira, 1979b).

In addition to ESL, other instructional models include bilingual, bilingual-bicultural, or bilingual-bicultural-bicognitive education programs. In contrast with ESL, bilingual education is based on the rationale that students learn best when taught in their native language and that LEP students should have the opportunity to keep pace with their English-speaking peers who are learning other subjects.

When the study of the history and culture associated with a students' mother tongue is included in a bilingual program bilingual-bicultural education results. A few proponents of comprehensive bilingual programs argue that LEP students have developed different cognitive styles as a result of their socialization experiences and thus should be taught using teaching styles and strategies different from their English proficient peers. This

is termed bilingual-bicultural-bicognitive education, and has obvious implications for resegregation (Lopez, 1978; Ramirez, 1973; Ramirez & Castaneda, 1974).

When bilingual programs are established as one-way maintenance programs for Hispanos only, they are equivalent to the establishment of a dual educational system. Two-way programs are, by definition, integrated.

While the resegregative impact of bilingual programs for the LEP child is dependent on the extent to which they are organized to minimize pullout from regular classes and their success at developing English proficiency, there is some evidence that they may have a resegregative effect on minority ethnic children who are not seriously deficient in English. Children are sometimes assigned to bilingual classrooms and programs according to their ethnicity rather than lack of English proficiency (Epstein, 1977; Carter 1979; American Institute for Research, 1977-1978; Orfield, 1977). Where bilingual programs require inclusion of non-LEP students, those included may be English proficient Hispanos, which contributes to ethnic resegregation (Carter, 1979). Another reason that English-speaking Hispanos are heavily represented in bilingual transitional programs is that transfer out of many of these programs seldom occurs, creating Hispanic tracks within the school (American Institute for Research, 1977-1978).

Because students receiving bilingual education are also frequently eligible for other compensatory services based on poverty and/or low achievement. They are at special risk of being resegregated through frequent pullouts for multiple categorical programs. When large numbers of children are multiply eligible, some school districts organize these recipients into classes, resulting in a segregated track within the school (Kimbrough & Hill, 1981).

The Relationship of Bilingual Education to Desegregation

The relationship of bilingual education and desegregation is a "double-edged sword." While bilingual education may be a resegregative threat to desegregation, desegregation may be a threat to the integrity of bilingual education programs.

"In several cases since 1974, the very existence of ongoing bilingual bicultural programs has been seriously threatened by the imminence of a school desegregation decree" (Cohen, 1975). This threat is usually manifested in the proposed application of strict ratios in the student assignment plan (Fernandez & Guskin, 1981). Thus, Hispanic involvement in recent desegregation cases has been at the remedy stage in attempts to preserve the integrity of bilingual programs (Fernandez & Guskin, 1981); such was the case in Milwaukee (Baez, Fernandez, & Guskin, 1980) and Boston (Aspira, 1980; Brisk, 1975).

There is some indication that students who may need bilingual education or ESL are more likely to participate in these programs in highly segregated school systems. "It appears that segregation highlights the need for special language programs, serves as an incentive for implementing these programs, and facilitates provision of the programs" (Aspira, 1979a). Desegregation has resulted in dispersion of LEP students throughout a district, fragmentation of bilingual teaching teams, and resulted in individual pullout of students for bilingual services that had been provided in organized group programs prior to desegregation. Furthermore, the dispersion of LEP students exacerbates tensions between those who want transition programs and the Hispanic community which generally favors maintenance programs (Aspira, 1979a; Fernandez & Guskin, 1978).

Carter (1979) suggested that desegregation need not become a threat to bilingual education. He noted the increasingly popular movement from emphasis

on the racial balance of schools toward considering ethnic/racial isolation, an approach that would allow a critical mass of LEP students to be assigned to particular schools rather than evenly dispersed throughout a district facilitating provision of needed special services as well as integration. Theoretically, a variety of goals and organizational characteristics could be combined in bilingual education programs. In fact, very little is known about their consequences for resegregation.

Summary: Resegregation Through Academic Programs

We have reviewed the academic/programmatic regularities which schools use to address academic heterogeneity of the student population. The resegregative effects of these regularities--ability grouping and tracking, compensatory education, special education, and bilingual education--have been documented. There are three factors associated with resegregation through these practices: student assignment, program organization, and multiple eligibility for categorical programs. Student assignment is a complex decision-making process with potential for bias in testing, school personnel judgments, and student and parent choice. Such student assignment practices tend to result in overrepresentation of minority children in the lower academic groupings and underrepresentation in the higher academic groupings.

Program organization varies with the practice. Ability grouping and tracking too often become rigid organizational structures from which it is difficult to escape. Compensatory education is generally offered on a pull-out basis; special education and bilingual education vary along a continuum from pullout to full-time separate classes. The degree to which these grouping practices result in resegregation depends on the extent to which minorities are overrepresented in enrollment and the extent to which the children are segregated from the regular classroom. The problems that school districts face in attempting to deliver educational services are exacerbated by the

multiple program eligibility that results from fragmented public policymaking. It seems that while public policy has encouraged and financed school efforts to provide programs for identified groups of children, not enough attention has been devoted to the fact that individual children may belong to several groups.

The Impact of Discipline Practices on Resegregation

The behavioral regularities reflected in school discipline policy are the school's attempt to deal with diversity of the student population while maintaining the stability and order necessary to the business of teaching and learning. Since 1973, when the Southern Regional Council published The Student Pushout: Victims of Continued Resistance to Desegregation, there has been concern about the exclusion of minority children from desegregated schools for disciplinary reasons. The council suggested that newly desegregated districts suspended and expelled disproportionate numbers of black youngsters, starting them on a cycle that resulted ultimately in dropping out of school. This pushout phenomenon is thus thought to contribute to resegregation.

In this section, we will (1) document the racial disproportionality in suspension and drop-outs in American schools, (2) examine their relationships to school desegregation, and (3) explore the possibility that this disproportionality results from discriminatory administration of discipline and negative school climates and teacher attitudes.

Resegregation Through Suspensions

Suspensions are a widely used disciplinary technique. Based on the OCR fall 1973 survey of 2,917 school districts, the Children's Defense Fund (1974) estimated that one out of every 20 school age children was suspended in the 1972-73 school year.

Suspension is an overwhelmingly secondary school practice; the figure was

8% for secondary students in 1972-73 (Kaeser, 1979b) with many districts far exceeding this. In spite of this trend, minority students are suspended at younger ages than whites (Children's Defense Fund, 1974).

A clear pattern of race disproportions in suspension has been extensively documented in LEAs across the country. Black students were from two to five times as likely to be suspended as white students in all regions of the country (National Public Radio, 1974; Children's Defense Fund, 1974; Arnez, 1976, 1978, Kaeser, 1979b).

Black students were not only suspended at a greater rate than white students, but also received lengthier suspensions (Hall, 1978) and are also more likely to be repeatedly suspended (Children's Defense Fund 1974).

The data for Hispanos was mixed, with few regions showing large disparities. Those regions with the largest Hispanic enrollments report a slightly smaller proportion of Hispanos suspended than whites (Carter 1981; Aspira, 1979b).

The Relationship of Suspension to Desegregation

In order to determine the resegregative impact of the disparity in suspensions of minority students, it would be useful to have data on suspensions before desegregation to determine if disproportions increased. Although most school districts did not analyze discipline data prior to desegregation, there is some direct evidence of an increase in disproportionate suspensions and a good deal of suggestive related material.

A number of districts show an overall increase in the number of suspensions during the first year of desegregation (Columbus Public Schools, 1980; Project Student Concerns, 1979; Foster, 1977; Southern Regional Council, 1979). Several cities report an increase in the disparity between black and white suspensions as well as this increase in overall suspension rates subsequent to desegregation (Southern Regional Council, 1979) although some note that this was a transient phenomenon in their district and declined after the first

post-desegregation year (Trent, 1981).

Adding to the concern that disproportionate suspensions are acting to resegregate students is growing evidence that post-desegregation suspension rates may be related to the racial composition of the school. In a number of districts, suspensions of black students were most pronounced in racially balanced schools that had recently undergone desegregation; previously integrated schools that experienced little change in black enrollment underwent little change (Larkin, 1979; Hall, 1978; Southern Regional Council, 1979). Thus it is the schools with the greatest potential for interracial contact that are most prone to use disciplinary techniques that substantially resegregate students within the school.

Resegregation Through Dropout Patterns

While disciplinary suspension temporarily removes children from schools, the dropout leaves permanently. Just as there is racial and ethnic disparity in suspension practices, there is such disproportionality in dropout rates. Compared to the national dropout rate for 14-17 year-olds of 10%, the rate was 15% for blacks, 20% for Hispanos, and 22% for American Indians (National Center for Education Statistics, 1981). This national pattern is reported in most, but not all, more focused studies of black dropout rates (Grantham, 1981; Bennett, 1981; Bennett & Harris, 1981; Green & Cohen, 1979). Hispanos tend to complete fewer years of schooling, dropping out at a younger age (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974; Aspira, 1979b; Haro, 1977; Carter, 1970a).

Although there is surprisingly little evidence that the same students who are repeatedly suspended eventually drop out of school, districts with high suspension rates also have high dropout rates (Grantham, 1981). Schools which had high rates of black suspensions also had disproportionate numbers of black students dropping out of school (Bennett & Harris, 1981; Grantham, 1981). This suggests that the fear of disproportionate suspensions leading

to "pushout" of minority students is warranted. There is some evidence linking segregation with higher dropout rates for Hispanos and blacks (Aspira, 1979b).

In the only study directly linking dropout rate to desegregation, Felice and Richardson concluded that the dropout rate for minority students is dependent upon the social climate of the schools into which they are placed. Their major finding was that minority students in higher SES school environments with more favorable teacher expectations had lower dropout rates (Felice & Richardson, 1977).

Reasons Resegregation Occurs Through Discipline Procedures

There have been a number of reasons advanced to account for the racial and ethnic disparity in disciplinary actions. Some suggest that the disproportion stems from greater misbehavior on the part of minority students. Others point to differential application of school behavior standards. The increase of suspensions that occurs when minority students attend previously all-white schools suggests that a combination of factors may be at work, abetted by insensitivity of school professionals to cultural differences in behavior.

The large disparities in suspension rates among schools, even within districts, argue against blaming students. Many schools and districts with high minority enrollments do not suspend minority students at a high rate (Children's Defense Fund, 1975; Van Fleet, 1977). Beneath the overall pattern of racial disparity in a district, enormous variations among individual schools exist (Kaeser, 1979b; Larkin, 1979; Project Student Concerns, 1977). These differences in suspension rates seem to reflect the ways in which particular principals and teachers apply rules. Some educators do not use suspension at all; others use it infrequently; others use it frequently for a wide range of offenses. It is in school districts that use it frequently that the disproportion of minorities is also high.

The notion that heavy use of suspension is determined by the inclinations

of school personnel rather than student behavior is strengthened by several studies identifying behaviors leading to suspension. In general, suspensions for all students are primarily given for behavior that is not violent or dangerous to person or property.

Attendance violations such as cutting classes, truancy, tardiness were the most frequent suspendable offenses followed by smoking, nonviolent disruptive acts, violation of school rules such as bus and cafeteria conduct, physical violence or threat of it, and such other major offenses as theft or drug use (Project Student Concerns, 1977; Children's Defense Fund, 1974).

Although not all studies have shown differences in the types of offenses leading to suspension, where there are differences, blacks are often found to be suspended for less dangerous offenses. Studies conducted in Tampa, Dallas, and Cleveland concluded that black children were more likely to be suspended for "subjective" offenses rather than "objective" ones. Subjective offenses were those requiring a personal judgment and included disobedience, insubordination, disruptive or disrespectful behavior, profanity, and dress code violations. Objective offenses that can be more clearly measured included use of alcohol or drugs, assault, possession of weapons, truancy, and the like (Foster, 1977). There is also some evidence that black students are punished for offenses allowed white students (Foster, 1977, Green & Cohen, 1979) or given heavier penalties for similar offenses (Southern Regional Council, 1974).

School climate and teacher attitudes are also associated with discipline problems generally. Desegregation results in a socially heterogeneous population of students within the school. Many teachers are confronted with students whose behavior they do not understand, and they feel ill equipped to respond to or cope with such behavior.

Hispanic students come from a culture in which norms of appropriate

behavior differ from white norms. Teachers confronted with Hispanic-appropriate behavior may tend to interpret that behavior from their own Anglo-normative base, thus misinterpreting the student's behavior, intentions, or needs. Black students may adopt styles of dress and behavior that are in conflict with school professionals' sense of propriety. The initial period of desegregation would be particularly difficult; one might expect to find the increase in discipline problems and suspensions that has, in fact, occurred.

There is some evidence that teachers in desegregated schools recognize that a lack of effective communication with students from cultures different from their own contribute to discipline problems (Trent, 1981, Wynn, 1971).

Just as positive teacher attitudes about integration contribute to selection of instructional strategies that facilitate integration (Epstein, 1980), they are also associated with fewer discipline problems. Teachers who support busing for desegregation perceive a smaller increase in discipline problems than teachers who oppose it (Peretti, 1976). A pattern of differences between student and staff perceptions in schools with a high disproportionality in suspensions and dropouts and in those with low disproportionality have been noted. Unfair punishment is a characteristic perceived by students in high disproportionality schools (Bennett & Harris, 1981).

In summary, there is evidence that discipline practices contribute to resegregation within desegregated schools. Suspensions are a common disciplinary technique, and black students are much more likely to be suspended than other students. This phenomenon of racial disparity is thought to be accute in recently desegregated schools, particularly those with a proportion of black students above 15%.

The sources of this disparity are not clear, but there is some evidence that the blame cannot be laid entirely on misbehavior of black students. Blacks are somewhat more likely to meet disciplinary action for "subjective"

offenses in which school personnel--who may have had little previous contact with black students--must make judgments about appropriate dress, insubordination, and so forth. The tendency for black students to be disproportionally suspended is associated with negative teacher attitudes towards integration with reports of communication problems between the races and a perception that discipline is unfairly administered.

Racial disparity in dropout patterns has also been observed, and there is an association between suspension patterns and dropout patterns in schools. Perhaps the school dropout is the most clear-cut behavioral manifestation of a lack of fit between two cultures--that of the student and that of the school.

Alternatives to Resegregative Practices

In order for schools to reduce or eliminate within-school resegregation, they must implement fundamental changes in the organization of instruction and in the assessment of student performance and in their ways of dealing with student behavior. Student assessment should incorporate a wide range of information from a variety of sources and should be interpreted by well-informed consumers of testing information. Instruction should be organized so that heterogeneous groups of students have the opportunity for educational interaction; special support services should be provided with as much integration with the regular school program as possible. Student discipline should emphasize keeping students in school, dealing with the sources of behavior problems including the influence of school climate on behavior, and the development and enforcement of discipline policy in a racially and ethnically equitable manner.

The perpetuation of traditional instructional and organizational practices may be due to a lack of knowledge regarding the universe of alternatives to

these practices. Solutions to the problem of resegregation are much more complicated than simply ending ability grouping and tracking, adding alternative discipline systems or sensitizing teachers. There are differences in children's ability to do schoolwork and children to have different needs that must be accommodated by differences in instruction and curriculum. The task is to find methods of assignment, instruction, and organization that are responsive to differences and yet encourage equal status interracial contact.

In the following sections some approaches to these traditional practices which may reduce the need for resegregation will be identified. We will first describe alternatives for assessment of students for group placement and provision of special services, then describe some less segregative alternatives for the delivery of categorical services. The alternatives, in turn, suggest the need for instructional strategies for working with heterogeneous groups. Finally, we will discuss alternatives to suspension as a disciplinary tactic.

Alternative Assessment Strategies to Assure More Effective Placement

Ability and achievement testing are the major tools for assigning students to homogeneous groups (Findley & Bryan, 1971). Minority children are "at risk" in the assessment stage of service delivery given their substantially lower scores on standardized tests of intelligence and achievement (Shuey, 1966; Samuda, 1975; Joseph, 1977). Though we have been aware of the distortions in test results created by cultural factors for years, this debate has only recently been forcefully brought to our attention through litigation (Oakland & Ferginbaum, 1980). Cook (1979b) has criticized these court decisions (e.g., Diana, Larry P., & PASE) for their narrow focus on the tests used in the assessment process. She explained that there are three sources of bias in assessment: (1) the tests themselves, (2) the assessment process or examiner-examinee transaction, and (3) the decision-making process. Cook (1979a, 1981)

has proposed a conceptual framework for nondiscriminatory assessment, proposing five models: (1) psychometric, (2) alternative, (3) transactional, (4) ecological, and (5) interdisciplinary. These five models are described and offered here as strategies to avoid or reduce resegregation at the assessment stage.

The psychometric model attempts to control for bias as a result of the characteristics of the testing instruments used in assessment. The first approach within the psychometric model is the development of tests with attention to minority representation throughout all phases of the development of the test itself. The second approach requires that existing tests be used and interpreted with respect to their psychometric properties. One such example is Kaufman's (1979) interpretation guidelines for the WISC-R which is based in the research regarding the WISC-R in addition to knowledge of the psychometric basis of the test and test administration. The publication of multiple norms so that individual children could be compared to the norm for their group as well as other groups, and development of local norms will also assist in interpretation of the results. A third approach, which has generally been regarded as a failure (Sattler, 1974), has been the development of tests which are designed to either reduce cultural influences or produce culture-free or culture-fair tests. The fourth, and opposite, approach of developing culturally specific tests (e.g., Williams, 1975) has been found equally unacceptable (Bennett, 1970). The psychometric model includes the development of tests based on sound technical aspects and the interpretation of all tests with respect for their psychometric properties. The psychometric model is necessary but not sufficient for a nondiscriminatory assessment.

The alternative assessment model attempts to control for bias by using non-traditional assessment techniques which are potentially culture fair. The first of these alternatives is criterion-referenced assessment, a measurement approach in which a level of mastery of the tested material is

obtained as a "score" (Popham & Husek, 1969). At first impression, criterion-referenced assessment appears to be "culture fair." However, the objectives chosen for learning and social behavior and the nature of the test items will, by definition, reflect the culture of the school. The second alternative model is that of Piagetian assessment which had been hoped would be culture-free, however, Boehm (1966) and Hunt and Kirk (1974) demonstrated marked differences in the attainment of concepts by children in varying socio-economic groups. The third alternative, learning-potential assessment uses a test-teach-retest paradigm where actual learning ability and strategy is observed. Such an approach is used by Feuerstein (1979) in his Learning Potential Assessment Device and by Budoff and his associates in research (Budoff, 1967; Budoff, 1972; Budoff & Friedman, 1964). Both Feuerstein and Budoff conclude that a large number of IQ-defined retardates show learning potential, and are not mentally retarded but educationally retarded. Learning-potential assessment procedures show promise for predicting the ability to learn.

The transactional assessment model attempts to control for bias resulting from examiner x student x environment transaction. In the large sense, this bias results from the examiner's unfamiliarity with the cultural background of the student. Transactional assessment is a process approach to assessment which fully involves the examiner (Cook & Plas, 1980; Fischer & Brodsky, 1978), student (Byrnes, 1979; Cook, 1979b; Cook & Lundberg, 1978, Fischer & Brodsky, 1978), and perhaps the student's family (Coles, 1977; Martinez-Morales & Cook, 1981; Ramirez & Castaneda, 1974) in order to maximize student performance. A second aspect of transactional assessment is the emphasis on the way the child approaches the task rather than the score that he/she achieves by expert clinical observation during the testing session (Meyers, Sunstrom, & Yoshida, 1974) and/or by "testing the limits", i.e., going back to the item after standardized administration and varying directions, time, guidance, etc. in

completing the task (Sattler, 1974) transactional assessment procedures rely on the individual expertise of the examiner and his/her awareness of the cultural influences on his/her own observations and conclusions.

The ecological assessment model attempts to control for bias by examining the child in the context of his/her ecologies, comparing competencies across settings. Wallace and Larsen (1978) describe the diagnostic tools used in ecological assessment: systematic observation, teacher-child interaction systems, checklists and rating scales, and sociometric techniques. Because ecological assessment should include assessment of the child in his/her ecologies other than school, assessment of adaptive behavior is included in this model. The inclusion of adaptive behavior assessment is an extremely potent nondiscriminatory assessment procedure (cf., Mercer, 1973). Adaptive behavior assessment is essential for a nondiscriminatory assessment and its consideration in the diagnosis of mental retardation is required under P.L. 94-142.

The interdisciplinary assessment model attempts to control for bias as a result of the human decision-making process. This approach brings together a variety of professionals who have worked with the child with their discipline's techniques, approaches, and frameworks. The interdisciplinary team is to include the child's teacher as the professional educator with whom the child has the most contact. Furthermore, the child's parents are essential members of the team and the child him/herself may be included. The interdisciplinary approach alone does not constitute a nondiscriminatory assessment, furthermore this approach appears to be poorly implemented in that parents are functionally excluded and team decisions are influenced by bureaucratic factors rather than the needs of the child (Weatherly, 1979).

Because each of the models of nondiscriminatory assessment described above addresses different sources of bias in the assessment process, it is obvious that no one model can stand alone in the nondiscriminatory assessment of children. Rather, these models need to be integrated in an approach to service delivery. One attempt at an integrated approach is that of the System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment (SOMPA) (Mercer & Lewis, 1978). The SOMPA is the best organized approach to nondiscriminatory assessment, however, it has not gone without criticism (cf., Oakland, 1979; Brown, 1979; Goodman, 1979). The SOMPA is only one attempt at integration of some of the components of the five models of nondiscriminatory assessment. A fully integrated approach would rely on a nondiscriminatory model of service delivery by well-trained professionals of an interdisciplinary team. These professionals should have an understanding and respect for cultural diversity; a firm knowledge of child development, pathology, and education; and the ability to go beyond traditional psychometric procedures using alternative assessment; and the ability to work well with other professionals, the regular classroom teacher, parents, and children.

Alternatives in the Organization of Categorical Programs

The degree to which compensatory education, special education, and bilingual education result in resegregation is very much a function of their organization. Alternatives in the organization of categorical programs have a common focus on reducing reliance on pullout and integrating special services into the regular educational program of the school.

Compensatory Education

Organization relying on "pull out" has been almost universal in compensatory education programs. Since a primary cause for reliance on pullout in compensatory education programs lies in the federal guidelines for achieving compliance, then alternative allocative and regulatory mechanisms may reduce this practice and concomitantly, its resegregative effects. The new amendments to Title I which authorize simplifying record keeping and reporting requirements provide an opportunity to address this issue in the regulations.

There have been a number of demonstration projects that relax Title I regulations governing the targeting of services and combining of funds across compensatory programs. One of these programs allows services to be provided to all students in a school where 75% of them are eligible. These changes have resulted in the reduction or elimination of pullout and the instituting of in-class compensatory programs. Reductions in compensatory services were more than offset by the additional instruction in the regular classroom (Milne, 1977; Rubin & David, 1981). However, schools with students eligible for compensatory aid may continue to find pullout the most practical way to deliver services.

Another method for avoiding pullout is to provide Title I services in the regular classroom by defining the role of the Title I specialist as a consultant and resource person rather than simply as a subject matter specialist.

Instead of working with groups of students, the resource teachers act as consultants to regular classroom teachers and other school personnel. They assist teachers in assessing specific learning problems and preparing individual learning plans, train classroom aides and parent volunteers, and help the principal plan the schoolwide instructional program (Tobin & Bonner, 1978). This resolves the frequent problem of a loss of coordination between the students' regular and compensatory instructional program, as well.

The success of compensatory education is dependent on coordination and joint planning of regular and compensatory programs (Glass & Smith, 1977; Frechtling & Hammond, 1978) and the school climate (Rossi et al., 1977; Coulson, Hanes, Ozene, Bradford, Doherty, Duck, & Hemenway, 1977). Pullout wreaks havoc with the classroom teachers' ability to plan and schedule instruction in the core curriculum (Kimbrough & Hill, 1981), but problems in coordination and planning are difficult to overcome even where regulations are relaxed.

Special Education

In special education, mainstreaming (at least part-time placement in a regular classroom), is the major alternative to special class placement. Civil rights concerns regarding the disproportionate placement of black and Hispanic children in EMR classes were one of the major forces in the mainstreaming movement (Dunn, 1968). Most research comparing the effects of mainstreaming and special classes on academic achievement of EMR children has failed to show significant differences between the two (Abramson, 1980; Corman & Gottlieb, 1978; Semmel et al., 1979).

There is also little evidence that mainstreamed EMR children have more positive self-concepts or higher rates of self-acceptance by their nonretarded peers (Corman & Gottlieb, 1978; Semmel et al., 1979). However,

little attention has been paid to the variety of mainstreaming conditions that are possible. The amount of time spent in regular classrooms, the availability of resource room and other support services, and the organization and curricula of regular and special classes are variables that have seldom been examined in research on mainstreaming. In addition, there is little information about the effects of mainstreaming on minority children. Available data suggest, however, that mainstreamed minority students from EMR classes may be placed in low-track classes that are as racially isolated as the special education (Kaufman, Agard, & Semmel, 1978). Thus, the effectiveness of mainstreaming in reducing resegregation depends on the extent to which regular classrooms are integrated and organized heterogeneously.

At this time, no particular special education program, mainstreamed or segregated, has strong empirical support in either the cognitive or the affective domain. Thus the strongest arguments in favor of mainstreaming remain legal and moral ones: "The argument (is) not advanced that retarded children will perform better in mainstreamed settings, only that they will not perform worse. The data support the latter assertion" (Semmel et al., 1979, p. 269). Where minority children are disproportionately assigned to EMR classes, mainstreaming will avoid this resegregation only if regular classrooms are integrated.

Bilingual Education

The relationship of the continuum of models of bilingual education to resegregation is primarily found in the characteristics of the students participating in each of these models. English as a Second Language (ESL) is by definition segregative, since the only participants in ESL programs are Limited-English-Proficiency (LEP) students. However, participation in ESL classes is likely to be for only a portion of the day and/or for only a

relatively short term within the child's educational career. Therefore, the segregative nature of the program by its participants may be offset by the time in that segregated activity. All other models (bilingual education, bilingual-bicultural education, bilingual-bicultural-bicognitive education) may be segregative or integrative depending on the goals (transition or maintenance), student participants (one-way or two-way), and organizational structure.

When considering resegregation, the choice of a transition or maintenance program must rely in great part on the expected participants in the program (one-way or two-way). Transition programs are generally associated with remedial or compensatory education; such programs will not attract white or black students (Carter, 1979; Epstein, 1977; Fernandez & Guskin, 1981; Vazquez, 1976). Thus, participants in a transition program are likely to be Hispanos or other linguistic minorities. The segregation by ethnicity may be offset by the temporary nature of the program if transition is, in fact, effected. Should a district choose to implement a transitional program, emphasis must be placed on the organizational structure of the program if resegregation is to be minimized with maximum time spent in integrated settings. LEP students may join their English-proficient peers for coursework and activities that do not rely on English proficiency . Time spent in the bilingual program may also decrease with the age of the child so that eventually the child is involved in the program only for Spanish language classes.

Two-way maintenance programs are by definition integrative. Such programs are most appropriate for communities having a relatively large proportion of Hispanos. The involvement of other-than-Hispanic students is most likely to occur under local circumstances where Spanish proficiency has economic and political relevance. An example is Dade County, Florida (Cohen, 1975; Gaarder, 1975; Mackey & Beebe, 1977). These programs tend to be "fragile,"

that is, their continued existence depends upon the commitment of school personnel and the community to the program (Carter & Segura, 1979).

There is very little evidence on the extent of different types of bilingual education programs or on their consequences. In theory, alternatives that emphasize transition into the mainstream, or programs that involve two-way language acquisition and include English-proficient students, should be the least resegregative.

Alternatives to the Instructional and Organizational Practices Within the Regular Education Program

More "mainstreamed" delivery of categorical services and the reduction of ability grouping in regular classes require the use of organizational and instructional techniques that accommodate student diversity. Schools have traditionally responded to diversity in the regular education program by creating homogeneous instructional groups. Given the evidence on the racial and ethnic segregation in tracked and ability-grouped classrooms, the implications of flexible and heterogeneous grouping for avoiding resegregation are clear. A variety of instructional practices have been developed for use in classrooms that encompass a wide range of individual differences in ability and achievement. These alternatives differ in their approach to heterogeneity. Some emphasize individualized instruction, while others use small groups. Classroom and staff organization may also increase flexibility and thus enhance capacity for handling student diversity. While there is a very great need for further research and development on this topic, there are a few organizational and instructional alternatives which have been shown to have positive effects on interracial contact and educational attainment.

Cooperative Learning Techniques

The most promising research and practical application in the area of classroom organization is the family of techniques called cooperative learning

or student team learning. These instructional methods involve students working together in small, heterogeneous groups to learn academic materials and may include intergroup competition. Some relevant research reports are Johnson and Johnson (1974); Weigel, Wisner, and Cook (1975); Lucker, Rosenfield, and Aronson (1976); Hamblin, Hathaway, and Wodarski (1971); and Slavin (1977a, 1977b, 1977c, 1977d, 1977e, 1977f, 1978a, 1978b, 1979a, 1979b, 1979c, 1979d, 1980a, 1980b).

These techniques usually involve the creation of teams of students. Each team of roughly four to six students represents the full range of ethnic groups, ability, and gender in the classroom. Academic work is structured so that the children on each team are dependent on each other but also so that disparity in achievement levels does not lead automatically to disparity in contributions to group goal attainment. For example, one team learning technique (Jigsaw) is structured so that each child is given information which all group members need to complete their work. Another technique, Student Teams-Achievement Division (STAD) gives rewards for improvement in academic performance, so that students with weak academic backgrounds have the potential to contribute as much to the success of the team as do the best students.

There is a considerable body of evidence which suggests that these approaches lead to higher than usual academic achievement gains for low-achieving students and almost always improve relations between majority and minority group children (Slavin, 1980; Sharan, 1980). Compared to individualized instruction, the cooperative learning method produced higher achievement on a test of the materials studied and slightly more positive effect on students' self-concept, especially regarding peer relationships (DeVries, Lucassee, & Shackman, 1979).

The work of Elizabeth Cohen and others on the Multi-Ability Classroom (MAC) has also shown promising results in fostering equal participant and

influence in cooperative learning groups. This approach is based on the premise that students need special preparation for participation in cooperative mixed-ability groups in order to counter the effects of status generalization often found in heterogeneous and racially integrated classrooms. Rosenholtz (1977), for example, found that children seen as high in reading ability and high in status in group reading tasks also have high status in task groups that do not require reading.

Mixed-ability groups are assigned cooperative learning tasks which require a number of abilities and do not exclusively rely on reading, writing, and computation skills. In addition, students are prepared for the task by discussing the range of abilities it requires and are instructed that while no group member will possess all of the necessary skills, every member will be able to contribute at least one. The multiple ability assignments may be preceded by Expectation Training in which low-status students are prepared for special tasks which they then teach to other students (Cohen, 1980).

Multiple ability intervention helps to equalize status and participation in cooperative learning groups of both single-race and multiracial composition (Stulac, 1975; Cohen, 1979; Rosenholtz, 1980) and assure group success (Blanchard, 1975). In addition, low-achieving minority students have been found to exhibit more active learning behavior in classrooms that approximate the MAC model (Cohen, 1980; Ahmadjian-Baer, 1981). Genova and Walberg (1979) note in their study of school integration, "racial mixing" is the key to success and interracial learning teams are the most effective strategy for fostering interracial interaction within classrooms.

Evidence concerning the impact of interracial academic cooperation without employing a specific team technique is less clear but suggestive of a positive impact (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1976; Slavin & Madden, 1979). This suggests that at the very least, teachers should not allow

groupings created for specific purposes such as reading instruction to spill-over into the organization of seating patterns and other instruction, especially if these specialized groupings prove to be racially segregative.

Individualized Instruction

Numerous approaches to and definitions of individualized instruction have been developed over the past two decades, as well as a professional consensus regarding its importance. The common elements of individualization usually include: (1) clearly written and/or stated academic objectives, (2) attention to individual needs, including individual diagnoses and prescription, and (3) structured sequential instruction (Archambault & St. Pierre, 1978). These characteristics have been emphasized in compensatory education and in special education (in the IEP requirements in P.L. 94-142, for example) as well as in individualized instruction techniques intended for general use.

Some educators have cautioned that individualized education programs may lead, ironically, to homogeneous grouping practices (Bailey, forthcoming). Students who are working at similar levels may be grouped together, and because of the self-paced nature of classroom work, interaction among students may be limited. Thus well-intentioned efforts to deal with individual differences may collide with the goals of integrated education if they contribute to the racial and social stratification of students. Perhaps as a result of these concerns, proponents of various individualization techniques specify ways that they can be used in combination with flexible grouping practices (Bailey, forthcoming; Wang, 1979a). Examples include phasing of instruction and student self-scheduling.

Phasing describes a set of characteristics usually found in non-graded individualized programs, including the following: (1) instructional groups are temporary and student mobility among them is high, (2) groups are

separate for each subject area, (3) group assignment standards and instructional objectives are clearly specified, and (4) evaluation is based on individual progress. Bailey (forthcoming) describes a high school science course based on the phasing model in which students are randomly assigned to sections of a large class with a team of several teachers. Within this format students attend voluntarily selected lecture-discussions differentiated by level of cognitive difficulty, laboratory sessions based on sequential mastery of specific skills, heterogeneous discussion groups and field trips, and independent study and/or tutorial sessions. Thus students receive instruction in a variety of group settings. Similar programs have been implemented in multi-age classrooms, incorporating a combination of instructional groupings. In one program, for example, heterogeneous groups of students are scheduled for work in learning stations. While the heterogeneous groups are using the learning stations, the teachers select students with similar skill needs for small group instruction. An evaluation of this project reported achievement gains above the national norms, with an average gain of two years in reading and 1.5 years in arithmetic in one school year (District of Columbia Public Schools, 1980).

Self-scheduling is designed to increase students' sense of responsibility for their own learning and use of time and to achieve a better "fit" between students' rate of learning and available learning time. The self-schedule system differs from other individualized instruction systems in that students work on assignments in the order they choose for the amount of time they need and record their own scheduling. A concomitant effect of self-scheduling is to increase the instructional time available to the teacher, both by reducing classroom management activities and by insuring that fewer students will need attention at the same time (Wang, 1977a, 1977b).

Students using self-scheduling in an inner-city elementary school have

been found to complete more tasks in less time than students using the same individualized program but with block scheduling (Wang, 1979b). A self-scheduling system needs to be used with other classroom practices such as multi-age grouping and team teaching in order to provide opportunities for peer interaction in small groups.

Peer Tutoring

Cross-age tutoring, in which older low-achieving children teach younger low-achieving children, is based on the rationale that the tutee will benefit from additional individual help while the tutor will also learn through teaching and preparing to teach. Numerous peer tutoring programs were developed in the 1960s in inner-city schools with large black and Hispanic populations and were seen as a way to capitalize on classroom heterogeneity and to improve race relations (Gartner, Kohler, & Riessman, 1971). English-speaking and Spanish-speaking students, for example, can tutor each other in language skills and also gain cultural exposure and understanding.

Considerable evidence exists of cognitive and affective gains for older, low-achieving tutors. Evidence of comparable effects for tutees is less consistent. Some studies show positive academic and attitudinal changes for both tutor and tutee, while others have found that the benefits for the former do not also accrue to the latter (Devin-Sheehan, Feldman, & Allen, 1976).

While positive results have been found for both black and white same-race tutoring pairs, very few studies have examined mixed-race pairs. One study that did so found that cross-race tutoring produced greater interracial interaction and acceptance for both tutor and tutee, although there were no significant gains in achievement (Devin-Sheehan et al., 1976).

Team Organization

Team-organized schools group students in teams or mini-schools with an interdisciplinary group of teachers. Students are randomly assigned to teams

and typically stay in the same unit through several grade levels. The team organization is especially advocated for middle schools and is designed to increase classroom heterogeneity, reduce the focus on grade-level expectations, and increase student-teacher interaction. In a study comparing such schools with more traditionally organized ones, students in the team-organized schools had significantly more other-race friends and perceived their school's interracial climate more favorably (Damico, Green, & Bell-Nathaniel, 1981).

In summary, alternatives to homogeneous instruction are available and have been implemented. Cooperative learning techniques are presently the most well-researched of these; they represent the most direct attempt to establish interracial contact within the heterogeneous classroom while at the same time providing effective instruction.

Alternatives to Suspension

Alternatives to out-of-school suspension encompass both specific programs designed to reduce suspension and behavior problems and subsequent dropping out, and school characteristics and practices that have been associated with low suspension rates. Here examples of the range of in-school suspension (ISS) and related programs will be described, and available evidence on their effectiveness on reducing overall suspension rates and minority suspension rates will be summarized. Some common characteristics of low-suspension schools will also be noted.

In-School-Suspension Programs

There are three common models of in-school alternatives to suspension: guidance and counseling programs, time-out rooms, and in-school suspension centers. The latter category is a broad one in which the length of time, degree of isolations, and comprehensiveness of services varies a great deal. In fact, many programs are hybrids that include elements of all three types. In addition, there are alternative schools for students with severe behavior

problems and those who have already dropped out or been expelled from regular schools (Garibaldi, 1979).

Counseling programs. These programs provide individual, peer, or group counseling sessions for students, usually on a referral basis. Typically the objectives emphasize the improvement of self-concept, motivation, and attitude toward school. A variety of techniques such as Glasser's reality therapy, values clarification, conflict resolution, and decision making skills are employed (Bader, 1978; NIE, 1979). Some programs concentrate on helping students with problems to set academic and behavioral objectives (MaNab, 1978). Others focus on providing services on a schoolwide basis as a prevention effort. Examples of schoolwide programs include providing "desegregation aides" who conduct discussion sessions and conflict resolution activities (Higgins, 1974) and a program including regular classroom instruction in human relations, basic encounter groups for students and staff, parent training, and school and home "survival courses" for students with behavior problems (Bailey, 1978).

Time-out rooms. Students are simply sent to a vacant room to "cool off" after a classroom disruption or conflict with a teacher. No examples were found of school programs that rely exclusively on this device. Frequently it is one of a range of interventions or a first step that is followed by counseling or in-school suspension (NIE, 1979; Bailey, 1978).

In-school suspension centers and alternative schools. ISS centers are special classrooms where students are sent in lieu of out-of-school suspension. Students usually work on regular classroom assignments under the guidance of a supervising teacher; frequently additional academic services are also provided such as tutoring and study skills instruction (NIE, 1979). Counseling sessions and parent conferences are usually a part of the ISS program (NIE, 1979; Cotton, 1978). Students spend an average of three days in ISS (Garibaldi,

1979) on referral of teachers and/or administrators may be largely isolated from the rest of the school, eating lunch at separate times and remaining in one classroom all day. Some schools provide a continuum of ISS-type alternatives, ranging from only part-day and very short-term to totally self-contained centers (e.g., school within a school) with separate instructional programs to alternative schools at separate locations (NIE, 1979; Cotton, 1978).

Effectiveness of programs. Published evaluation data on suspension alternatives tend to be impressionistic and not very specific or complete. There is some evidence that these programs result in fewer out-of-school suspensions and lowered recidivism rates (NIE, 1979; Bader, 1978). Even without a reduction in racial disproportionality, significant reduction in use of suspension will reduce its resegregative impact.

Indications of reduced minority disproportion in suspension rates are few, even though this issue has been a major factor in recognition of "the suspension problem" that led to the establishment of many alternative programs (Garibaldi, 1979). Frequently racial data is not available. Some success in reducing minority disproportions in suspensions has been reported by programs in Dallas, Louisiana, and Florida (Cotton, 1978; NIE, 1979; Bailey, 1978).

ISS program administrators and observers continue to express concern about the degree of racial isolation and disproportion in the alternative programs themselves (Arnez, 1978; Arnove & Strout, 1980; NIE, 1979). These programs can become identified as "minority programs" especially when they involve a voluntary transfer to an alternative school and a number of highly segregated alternative schools have been noted (Williams, in NIE, 1979). Particular attention to this issue, including careful data collection on racial composition of the programs and teacher/principal referrals of minority students, has been recommended (Mizell, in NIE, 1979).

School Differences in Suspension

Studies of schools with low incidences of discipline problems and use of suspension have identified features or organization and school climate that appear to be related to the school's orderliness. It would be beyond the scope of this paper to extensively summarize the literature on the organizational climate of schools, but it is worth noting some of the findings related to school suspension rates.

Most authors agree that the leadership of the school principal is an important element in dealing with student behavior (Brodbelt, 1980; Kaeser, 1979a). In a study focusing on schools within a single district with relatively high and low suspension rates, several differences between the principals in the two groups of school were reported. According to both teachers' perceptions and principal's self-reports, principals in high-suspension schools placed primary emphasis on capable performance of their administrative functions and saw the principal as the central figure in the school. Principals in low-suspension schools gave higher priority to fostering mutual respect between students and staff. Principals in the low-suspension schools were reported to be more visible around the school, while those in the high-suspension schools spent more time in their offices. The authors note that the literature supports the inference that principals' visibility in the school positively affects student morale and behavior. Low-suspension principals felt they had more discretion in making discipline decisions than did high-suspension principals. There was no difference between the two groups of schools in student perceptions of the administration of discipline policy; student ratings of the consistency and fairness of enforcement were similar in high- and low-suspension schools (Bickel & Qualls, 1979).

Bickel and Qualls (1979) also found that teachers in low-suspension schools rated their school more positively on all items related to school

climate than did teachers in high-suspension schools. These items included assessment of students' respect for teachers, honesty and sincerity of people in the school, students' enjoyment of school, students' feeling of acceptance in school, and the school's learning environment. Teachers' respect for students is greater in the low-suspension schools, according to principals' reports. Classroom observers found no differences between the two groups of schools in the relationship of teacher-student interactions to students' race or sex. However, students in low-suspension schools rated teachers' nonverbal communication more positively than did students in high-suspension schools. Results of student ratings were less clear with school differences interacting with race and sex differences. White students in low-suspension schools rated their school climate more positively than did black students in both groups of schools and white students in high-suspension schools.

While the Louisville study identified climate and leadership differences in schools with low overall suspension rates, the disproportionate suspension of black students was not related to these characteristics (Bickel & Qualls, 1979). However, a case study of two school districts that examined schools with low minority disproportion in suspension found that perceptions of a favorable interracial climate and staff support for integration separated these schools from those with greater racial disparity (Bennett & Harris, 1981).

Alternative programs alone are probably not sufficient to correct racial disparity in enforcement of school discipline. Rather, the climate of the school must reflect an explicit concern with race relations in general and with interracial fairness in administering discipline. School administrators can manifest this concern in at least two ways. First, rules governing behavior and establishing disciplinary offenses should be developed with broad participation, including staff, students and parents. The common

expectations for behavior in school that result from this process should be widely communicated throughout the school. In addition, tardiness and other attendance-related offenses probably should not be punishable by suspension, and vague prohibitions that allow a great deal of discretion in enforcement, such as "insubordination," should probably be eliminated altogether. The second action that administrators can take is to analyze carefully the reasons for minority suspensions and other disciplinary actions.

Schools should keep records on suspension including the reason for the suspension, the teacher or staff person involved, and the race and sex of the student involved. This allows the school principal, parents and others to analyze the reasons for suspension by race and sex, and to determine if particular teachers or staff members have problems needing attention. Until the leadership in a school understands the causes of disproportionate minority suspension in that school at that time, solutions are impossible.

In-service training for teachers and administrators can facilitate the implementation of these practices. Teachers frequently request in-service training in classroom management immediately after desegregation begins and such programs have been found to reduce discipline problems in recently desegregated schools. Administrators can also benefit from in-service training in developing and administering rules of conduct and in establishing a positive interracial climate (Smylie & Hawley, 1981).

Summary and Recommendations for Research and Development

The problem of resegregation usually grows out of schools' responses to externally imposed change. As school desegregation yields increasing academic and behavioral diversity within schools, schools rely on traditional assessment, instructional, and disciplinary practices that are aimed at producing homogeneous groups of students that also tend to be racially and ethnically more homogeneous than the school population at large. These practices may

be well-intentioned and based on the dominant educational philosophy of meeting individual educational needs. Nevertheless, the means for achieving this goal that are typically part of the school culture and manifested in its organizational routines conflict with the institution of educational processes that are intended to bring about integrated education in desegregated schools. This creates a paradox for students. As school level diversity increases, the diversity of contacts experienced by each student may actually decrease as homogeneous grouping practices are more extensively used to manage this diversity.

Academic grouping practices that are commonly used to manage diversity include: ability grouping and tracking, compensatory education, special education, and bilingual education. Resegregation results from pupil assignment practices and organization of these programs. Factors associated with resegregation through student assignment practices are use of standardized testing, cultural insensitivity of school personnel, and student and parent choice. Traditional student assignment practices invariably result in the disproportionate assignment of minority students to low ability groups and to other programs addressing academic deficiencies. The organization of the programs thus becomes crucial, for it is the organization that determines the degree to which the programs become resegregative.

Program organization determines the degree to which minority students have an opportunity for equal status interaction with their majority peers. Any ability grouping or tracking system will tend to resegregate as long as race and class are associated with measures of achievement. Flexible programs that group for particular goals will provide more opportunities for interracial contact than rigid programs that track students for all academic experiences on the basis of a particular achievement such as reading level. Full-time programs for special and bilingual education result in obvious resegre-

gation. Pullout programs may be potentially less segregative since less time is usually spent out of the regular classroom on a daily basis, as a result of their eligibility for multiple programs. The fragmented nature of the public policies mandating such programs and the concomitant fragmentation of the services provided at the school level serve to exacerbate the problem of resegregation.

The school's response to the social diversity of the student population is also reflected in its disciplinary procedures. Black students, more than Hispanos, are disproportionately suspended. Both blacks and Hispanos drop out of school at disproportionate rates, but Hispanos tend to have a higher dropout rate than blacks and tend to drop out at an earlier age. Teacher attitudes and school climate are associated with resegregation through discipline policies. Alternatives to suspension while potentially promising have not been shown to eliminate racial disproportionality in suspensions.

In order for schools to reduce or eliminate within-school resegregation, they must implement fundamental changes in the organization of instruction and in the assessment of student performance and in their ways of dealing with student behavior. Student assessment should incorporate a wide range of information from a variety of sources and should be interpreted by well-informed consumers of testing information. Instruction should be organized so that heterogeneous groups of students have the opportunity for educational interaction; special support services should be provided with as much integration with the regular school program as possible. Student discipline should emphasize keeping students in school, dealing with the sources of behavior problems including the influence of school climate on behavior, and the development and enforcement of discipline policy in a racially and ethnically equitable manner.

Part of the reason that traditional school practices which are resegregative persist may be the overwhelming nature of the changes required. For

teachers and administrators this means change in attitudes and behavior, as well as change in instructional methods and strategies for social control, and classroom management. Some of these changes are a part of adapting to any innovations, but in school desegregation, these problems--all of which are sources of personal stress--must be confronted simultaneously.

As noted previously, these are available alternatives to traditional methods of assignment, instruction, and organization that are responsive to differences and yet encourage equal status contact. However, these examples fall far short of an adequate technology for avoiding or eliminating resegregative practices.

In the course of gathering and analyzing information for this paper, we have become acutely aware of specific research needs in several areas related to resegregation. Almost every topic we investigated is characterized by gaps in data and analysis on sources of the problem, or by a paucity of alternative models to reduce the problem, or both. Frequently, the assertion that resegregation occurs is built on fragmented pieces of collateral evidence, because much of the research on educational practices is not conducted in a desegregated setting or the racial context is not specified.

The specific topics about which it seems research, development, evaluation and dissemination would be most important for making further progress in the reduction of resegregation are:

1. Instructional techniques for teaching heterogeneous groups of students. Only cooperative learning techniques among the flexible and heterogeneous grouping practices are backed by empirical evidence that provides considerable confidence of their effectiveness.
2. Scheduling, grouping and instructional practices to facilitate interaction among heterogeneous high school students. Resegregation is particularly acute in high schools where differentiation of the curri-

culum is most pronounced; there is almost no information about strategies to mitigate the separation that occurs.

3. Discipline techniques, including alternative forms of in-school suspension, that reduce the disproportionality of suspensions or exclusions of minority group children. The literature is replete with examples of techniques, but there is an absence of comparison among programs that would allow identification of program characteristics that are linked to desirable outcomes in different settings. There is also little evaluation data that assesses impact on disproportionate minority suspensions.
4. Further development and evaluation of psychological assessment techniques for evaluating minority children fairly. There is little evidence to suggest how currently developed experimental techniques affect assessment and placement of minority group children.
5. Development and assessment of alternative approaches to the delivery of categorical services. Little sustained analysis of effects of alternatives to pullout programs has been accomplished.

Traditional practices, though resegregative, have survived because they are thought to be necessary to achieve the two basic goals of the school, academic achievement for individual students and order. Until educators have techniques for effectively dealing with the educational needs of a diverse student body in an integrated setting, desegregation will not be seen as a viable educational strategy. Resegregation is a manifestation of the failure of desegregation as a philosophy that educators and parents believe in as a strategy that benefits children.

Bibliography

Abramson, M. Implications of mainstreaming: A challenge for special education. In L. Mann & D. Sabatino (Eds.), The fourth review of special education. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1980.

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Intergovernmentalizing the classroom: Federal involvement in elementary and secondary education. In The federal role in the federal system: The dynamics of growth (Vol. 5). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1981.

Ahmadjian-Baer, J. Producing more active learning behavior from poor readers: The multiple ability classroom. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Alexander, D., & Nana, A. The how, what, where, when, and why of bilingual education: A concise and objective guide for school district planning. San Francisco: R & E Research Association, 1977.

Aliotti, N. C. Alternative assessment strategies in a pluralistic society. School Psychology Digest, 1977, 6, 6-11.

American Institute for Research. Evaluation of the impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English bilingual education programs (4 vols.). Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institute for Research, 1977-1978.

American Psychological Association. Standards for educational and psychological tests. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1974.

Anastasi, A. Psychological testing (4th ed.). New York: MacMillan, 1976.

Archambault, F. X., & St. Pierre, R. G. A description of instructional experiences received by Title I and non-Title I students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 152 953)

Armer, B., & Thomas, B. K. Attitudes toward interdisciplinary collaboration in pupil personnel services teams. Journal of School Psychology, 1978, 16, 167-176.

Arnez, N. L. Desegregation of public schools: A discriminatory process. Journal of Afro-American Issues, 1976, 4, 274-282.

Arnez, N. L. Implementation of desegregation as a discriminatory process. Journal of Negro Education, 1978, 47, 28-45.

Arnove, R., & Strout, T. Alternative schools and cultural pluralism: Promise and reality. Educational Research Quarterly, 1978, 2(4), 74-95.

Arnove, R. F., & Strout, T. Alternative schools for disruptive youth. Educational Forum, 1980, 44, 453-471.

Aspira of America, Inc. Trends in segregation of Hispanic students in major school districts having large Hispanic enrollment: Analytic report (Vol. 3A). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1979. (a)

Aspira of America, Inc. Trends in segregation of Hispanic students in major school districts having large Hispanic enrollment: Ethnographic case studies (Vol. 2). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1979. (b)

Aspira of America, Inc. Trends in segregation of Hispanic students in major school districts having large Hispanic enrollment: Desegregation and the Hispano in America (Vol. 1). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1980.

Bader, P. A counseling alternative to suspension: School youth advocacy. In C. D. Moody, J. Williams & C. B. Vergon (Eds.), Student rights and discipline. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, School of Education, 1978.

Baez, T., Fernandez, R. R., & Guskin, J. T. Desegregation and Hispanic students: A community perspective. Rosalyn, Va.: InterAmerican Research Association, Inc., 1980.

Bailey, R. Staff, student and parent training as positive alternatives to student suspensions. In C. D. Moody, J. Williams & C. B. Vergon (Eds.), Student rights and discipline. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, School of Education, 1978.

Bailey, S. K., & Mosher, E. K. ESEA: The Office of Education administers a law. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1968.

Bailey, W. Collision: Court ordered desegregation and individualized instructional programs. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, (forthcoming).

Bell, R., & Semmel, E. Training specialists to work with disruptive students: Rationale and models. In School crime and disruption: Prevention models. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Bell strikes down bilingual regulations. National Journal, February 7, 1981, pp. 241-242.

Bennett, C. A study of the causes of disproportionality in suspensions and expulsions of male and black students. Part Two: Characteristics of high and low disproportionality schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Bennett, C., & Harris, J. J., III. A study of the causes of disproportionality on suspensions and expulsions of male and black students. Part One: Characteristics of disruptive and non-disruptive students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Bennett, G. K. Response to Robert Williams. Counseling Psychologists, 1970, 2(2), 88-89.

Berke, J. S., & Demarest, E. J. Alternatives for future federal programs. In M. F. Williams (Ed.), Government in the classroom. New York: Academy of Political Science, 1978.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. Federal support for improved educational practice. In P. M. Timpane (Ed.), The federal interest in financing schooling. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1978.

Bersoff, D. N. "Current functioning" myth: An overlook and fallacy in psychological assessment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 391-393.

Bersoff, D. N. The ethical practice of school psychology: A rebuttal and suggested model. Professional Psychology, 1973, 305-312.

Bickel, F., & Qualls, R. Project Student Concerns: A study of minority student suspensions (Interim Report). Louisville, Ky.: Jefferson County Educational Consortium, September 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 178 636)

Blanchard, F. A., Adelman, L., & Cook, S.W. The effect of group success and failure upon interpersonal attraction in cooperating interracial groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 1020-1030.

Block, E. E., Covill-Servo, J., & Rosen, M. F. Failing students, failing school. New York: New York Civil Liberties Union, 1978.

Boehm, A. E. The development of comparative concepts in primary school children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966.

Bolton, R. P. The effects of increased racial desegregation through busing: Perceptions of the Metropolitan Nashville teachers and administrators. Unpublished dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1973.

Breglio, V. J., Hinkley, R. H., & Beal, R. S. Students' economic and educational status and selection for compensatory education (Technical Report No. 2 from the Study of Sustaining Effects of Compensatory Education on Basic Skills). Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corporation, 1978.

Brischetto, R., & Arciniega, T. Examining the examinees: A look at educator's perspectives on the Chicano student. In R. O. De la Garza, Z. A. Kruszewski, & T. A. Arciniega (Eds.), Chicanos and native Americans: The territorial minorities. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Halls, 1973.

Brisk, M. E. Bilingual education and school desegregation: The case of Boston. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Conference for Bilingual-Bicultural Education, Chicago, May 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 126 999)

Brisk, M. E. Bilingual education legislation: The Boston desegregation case. In H. LaFontaine, B. Persky & L. Golubchick (Eds.), Bilingual education. Wayne, N.J.: Avery Publishing Company, 1978.

Brodbelt, S. Effective discipline: A consideration for improving inner-city schools. Clearing House, 1980, 54, 5-9.

Broh, C. A., & Hawley, W. D. Clarification of the goals of desegregation. Durham, N.C.: Duke University, Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, 1980.

Brookover, W., Brady, N. M., & Warfield, M. Educational policies and equitable education: A report of studies of two desegregated school systems. In Procedures and pilot research to develop an agenda for desegregation studies. East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University, College of Urban Development, Center for Urban Affairs, March 1981.

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 363-374.

Brown, F. The SOMPA: A system of measuring potential abilities. School Psychology Digest, 1979, 8, 37-46.

Budoff, M. Learning potential among institutionalized young adult retardates. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1967, 72, 404-411.

Budoff, M. Learning potential: A supplementary procedure for assessing the ability to reason. Seminars in Psychiatry, 1972, 10, 199-205.

Budoff, M., & Friedman, M. "Learning potential" as an assessment approach to the adolescent mentally retarded. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1964, 28, 433-439.

Budoff, M., Meskin, J., & Harrison, R. Educational test of the learning-potential hypothesis. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1971, 76, 159-169.

Byrnes, M. A. Student participation in educational planning. In a symposium, Informed involvement of the child in assessment and intervention, Council for Exceptional Children, Dallas, April 1979.

Caplan, G. The theory and practice of mental health consultation. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Cardenas, J. Desegregation and the Mexican American. In Desegregation and education concerns of the Hispanic community (Conference Report). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, June 1977.

Carlson, W. K. Schools without bells, or guards. Learning, 1976, 5, 89-93.

Carter, D. G. Student discrimination, disproportionality and the law. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Carter, T. P. Mexican Americans in school: A history of educational neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970. (a)

Carter, T. P. Preparing teachers for Mexican-American children. In H. Johnson, & W. Hernandez (Eds.), Educating the Mexican American. Valley Forge, Pa.: Judson Press, 1970. (b)

Carter, T. P. Interface between bilingual education and desegregation: A study of Arizona and California. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1979.

Carter, T. P., & Segura, R. D. Mexican Americans in school: A decade of change. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1979.

Center for National Policy Review. The rights of school children. Unpublished manuscript, Catholic University of America, Center for National Policy Review, July 1980.

Chennault, M. Improving the social acceptance of unpopular educable mentally retarded pupils in special classes. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1967, 72, 455-458.

Chesler, M. A., Crowfoot, J. E., & Bryant, B. I. Organizational context of school discipline: Analytic models and policy options. Education and Urban Society, 1979, 11, 496-510.

Children's Defense Fund. Children out of school in America. Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Funds, Washington Research Projects, 1974.

Children's Defense Fund. School suspensions: Are they helping children? Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund, September 1975.

Cleary, T. A., Humphreys, L. G., Kendrick, S., & Wesman, A. Educational uses of tests with disadvantaged students. American Psychologists, 1975, 30, 15-41.

Cohen, E. The effects of desegregation on race relations. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1975, 39(2), 271-299.

Cohen, E. A multi-ability approach to the integrated classroom. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, September 1980.

Cohen, R. A. Conceptual styles, culture conflict, and nonverbal tests of intelligence. American Anthropologist, 1969, 71, 828-856.

Coles, R. Eskimos, Chicanos, Indians: Volume IV of children in crisis. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.

Collins, T. W. From courtrooms to classrooms: Managing school desegregation in a deep south high school. In R. C. Rist (Ed.), Desegregated schools. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Columbus Public Schools. Report to the Federal District Court on the status of desegregation, Penick et al. v. Columbus Board of Education et al., November 16, 1979.

Columbus Public Schools. Report on the status of desegregation to the Federal District Court, Penick et al. v. Columbus Board of Education et al., November 20, 1980.

Columbus Public Schools. Report on the status of desegregation to the Federal District Court, Penick et al. v. Columbus Board of Education et al., March 25, 1981.

Cook, V. J. Psychometric critique of school testing litigation. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, New York, 1979. (a)

Cook, V. J. Results of the child's involvement in the school assessment and intervention process. In a symposium, Informed involvement of the child in assessment and intervention, Council for Exceptional Children, Dallas, April 1979. (b)

Cook, V. J. Systems intervention: A transactional-ecological perspective. In a symposium, Systems theory: Applications to the practice of school psychology, American Psychological Association, New York, 1979. (c)

Cook, V. J. Influences of home and family in the development of literacy in children. School Psychology Review, 1980, 9, 369-373.

Cook, V. J. Nondiscriminatory assessment: Research integration project. Proposal submitted to the Department of Education, 1981.

Cook, V. J., & Lundberg, D. D. The child's right to know. Presented at the National Association of School Psychologists, New York, March 1978.

Cook, V. J., & Plas, J. M. Making the relationship primary: Transactional-ecological psychology. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Montreal, 1980.

Corman, L., & Gottlieb, J. Mainstreaming mentally retarded children: A review of research. In N. R. Ellis (Ed.), International review of research in mental retardation (Vol. 9). New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Cotter, D. E., & Berk, R. A. Item bias in the WISC-R using black, white, and Hispanic learning disabled children. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Cotton, W. H. Strategies for reducing the disproportionate racial impact on suspensions: The Dallas experience. In C. D. Moody, J. Williams & C. B. Vergon (Eds.), Student rights and discipline. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, School of Education, 1978.

Coulson, J. E., Hanes, S. D., Ozene, D. G., Bradford, C., Doherty, W. J., Duck, G. A., & Hemenway, J. A. The third year of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) implementation. Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corporation, March 1977.

Crain, R. L., & Hawley, W. D. An agenda for further research on desegregation strategies (Vol. II). In W. D. Hawley (Ed.), Assessment of current knowledge about the effectiveness of school desegregation strategies. Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Center for Education and Human Development Policy, 1981.

Curtis, N. B. Testing responsibility - viewpoint of a practitioner. School Psychology Digest, 1977, 6, 12-14.

Damico, S. B., Green, C., & Bell-Nathaniel, A. Facilitating interracial contact: Let the structure do it for you. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Department of Education. Nondiscrimination under programs receiving financial assistance through the Education Department (Proposed rules). Federal Register, Tuesday, August 5, 1980, 45(152), 52051-52076.

Devin-Sheehan, L., Feldman, R. S., & Allen, V. L. Research on children tutoring children: A critical review. Review of Educational Research, 1976, 46, 355-385.

DeVries, D. L., Lucasse, P. R., & Shackman, S. L. Small groups versus individualized instruction: A field test of their relative effectiveness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, September 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184 006)

District of Columbia Public Schools. Meeting students' needs in the multi-age group environment. ESEA Title IV-C (Final Evaluation Report). Washington, D.C.: District of Columbia Public Schools, 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184 206).

Duffey, J. B., & Fedner, M. L. Educational diagnosis with instructional use. Exceptional Children, 1978, 44, 246-251.

Duke, D. L., & Meckel, A. M. Student attendance problems and school organization. Urban Education, 1980, 15, 325-357.

Duke, D. L., & Perry, C. Can alternative schools succeed where Benjamin Spock, Spiro Agnew, and B. F. Skinner have failed. Adolescence, 1978, 13, 375-392.

Dunn, L. Special education for the mildly retarded--Is much of it justifiable? Exceptional Children, 1968, 35, 5-22.

Edmonds, R. A. A discussion of the literature and issues related to effective schooling. St. Louis, Mo.: Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, 1979.

Educational Advocates Coalition. Report on federal compliance activities to implement the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142). Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund, April 1980.

Edwards, T. B. Teacher attitudes and cultural differentiation. Journal of Experimental Education, 1966, 35, 80-92.

Elementary reading skills improve. National Assessment of Educational Progress Newsletter, 1981, 14(1), 1-3.

Engin, Q. W., Leappaluoto, J. R., & Petty, S. Z. Multifactored unbiased assessment: A guide for school psychologists. School Psychology Digest, 1977, 6, 42-47.

Epstein, J. After the bus arrives: Resegregation in desegregated schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Epstein, N. Language, ethnicity, and the schools: Policy alternatives for bilingual-bicultural education. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, Institute for Educational Leadership, 1977.

Esposito, D. Homogeneous and heterogeneous ability grouping: Principal findings and implications for evaluating and designing more effective educational environments. New York: Columbia University, Teacher's College, July 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 056 150)

Evertson, C. M., Sanford, J. P., & Emmer, E. T. Effects of class heterogeneity in junior high school. American Educational Research Journal, 1981, 18, 219-232.

Felice, L. G., & Richardson, R. L. The effects of desegregation on minority student dropout rates. Integrated Education, 1977, 15(6), 47-50.

Fernandez, R. R., & Guskin, J. T. Bilingual education and desegregation: A new dimension in legal and educational decision-making. In H. Lafontaine, B. Persky & L. H. Golubchick (Eds.), Bilingual education. Wayne, N.J.: Avery Publishing Group Inc., 1978.

Fernandez, R. R., & Guskin, J. T. Hispanic students and school desegregation. In W. D. Hawley (Ed.), Effective school desegregation. Beverly Hills, Calif.: SAGE Publications, 1981.

Feuerstein, R. The dynamic assessment of retarded performers. Baltimore, Md.: University Park Press, 1979.

Figuero, R. A. The system of multicultural pluralistic assessment. School Psychology Digest, 1979, 8, 28-36.

Findley, W. G., & Bryan, M. M. Ability grouping, 1970: Status, impact, and alternatives. Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia, Center for Educational Improvement, 1971.

Findley, W. G., & Bryan, M. M. The pros and cons of ability grouping (Fastback No. 66). Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation, 1975.

Fischer, C. T., & Brodsky, I. L. (Eds.). Client participation in human services: The PROMETHRUS principle. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1978.

Flaugher, R. L. The many definitions of test bias. American Psychologist, 1978, 33, 671-679.

Forehand, G. A., Ragosta, M., & Rock, D. A. Conditions and processes of effective school desegregation. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, July 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 131 155)

Foster, G. Discipline practices in the Hillsborough County public schools. Unpublished manuscript, University of Miami at Coral Gables, Florida School Desegregation Consulting Center, April 1977.

Frechtling, J. A., & Hammond, P. A., III. Policy implications of the instructional dimensions study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 1978.

Freeman, J. L. The political process (Rev. ed.). New York: Random House, 1965.

Froman, R. D. Ability grouping: Why do we persist and should we? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Gaarder, A. B. Organization of the bilingual school. In E. Ogletree & D. Garcia (Eds.), Education of the Spanish-speaking urban child: A book of readings. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1975.

Gallagher, J. The special education contract for mildly handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 527-535.

Galusha, R. Director of Psychological Services, Omaha Public Schools. Personal communication, May 5-9, 1980.

Garibaldi, A. In-school alternatives to suspension: The state of the art. In In-school alternatives to suspension (Conference report). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, April 1979.

Gartner, A., Kohler, M. C., & Riessman, F. Children teach children. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Genova, W. J., & Walberg, H. J. Promoting student integration in city high schools: A research study and improvement guidelines for practitioners. Newton, Mass.: TDR Associates, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 181 161)

Gerard, H. B., & Miller, N. (Eds.). School desegregation: A long-range study. New York: Plenum Press, 1976.

Glass, G. V., & Smith, M. L. "Pull-out" in compensatory education. Boulder, Colo.: University of Colorado, Laboratory of Educational Research, 1977.

Goettel, R. J. Federal assistance to national target groups: The Title I experience. In M. Timpane (Ed.), The federal interest in financial schooling. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1978.

Goldberg, M. L., Passow, A. H., & Justman, J. The effects of ability grouping. New York: Columbia University, Teacher's College, 1966.

Goodman, J. F. Is tissue the issue? A critique of SOMPA's models and tests. School Psychology Digest, 1979, 8, 48-62.

Gottlieb, D. G. Teaching and students: The views of Negro and white teachers. Sociology of Education, 1964, 37, 345-353.

Gottlieb, J., Agard, J., Kaufman, M. J., & Semmel, M. I. Retarded children mainstreamed: Practices as they affect minority group children. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), Mainstreaming and the minority child. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota, Leadership Training Institute/Special Education, 1976.

Grantham, G. Student discipline issues before and after court-ordered desegregation in New Castle County, Delaware. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Green, R. L., & Cohen, W. J. An evaluation of the results of the school desegregation order in Michelle Oliver, et al. Plaintiffs v. Kalamazoo Board of Education, et al. Defendants. Report to the Honorable Noel P. Fox, Chief Judge of the United States District Court, Western District of Michigan, Southern Division, (368 F. Supp. 143 W. D. Mich. S. D. 1973), 1979.

Green, R. L., & Griffore, R. School desegregation, testing, and the urgent need for equity in education. Education, 1978, 99(1), 16-19.

Guy, D. P. Issues in the unbiased assessment of intelligence. School Psychology Digest, 1977, 6, 14-22.

Hall, L. Race and suspension: A second generation desegregation problem. In C. D. Moody, J. Williams & C. B. Vergon (Eds.), Student rights and discipline. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, School of Education, 1978.

Haller, E. J. Decisions at the margins: Toward an explanation of the relation between ability group placement and pupil SES. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Haller, E. J., & Davis, S. Does socioeconomic status bias the assignment of elementary school students to reading groups? American Educational Research Journal, 1890, 17, 409-418.

Hamblin, R., Hathaway, L. C., & Wodarski, J. S. Group contingencies, peer tutoring, and accelerating academic achievement. In E. Ramp & W. Hopkins (Eds.), A new direction for education: Behavior analysis. Lawrence, Kan.: University of Kansas, Department of Human Development, 1971.

Hargreaves, D. H., Hester, S., & Mellon, F. Deviance in classrooms. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Hargrove, E., Graham, S., Ward, L., Abernethy, V., Cunningham, J., & Vaughn, W. Regulations and schools: The implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Education Act. Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University, Institute for Public Policy Studies, 1981.

Harnischfeger, A., & Wiley, D. E. A merit assessment of vocational education programs in secondary schools. A statement to the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, September 1980.

Haro, C. M. Mexicano/Chicano concerns and school desegregation in Los Angeles. Los Angeles: University of California, Chicano Studies Center, 1977.

Hartlage, L. C., & Steele, C. T. WISC and WISC-R correlates of academic achievement. Psychology in the Schools, 1977, 14, 15-18.

Hawkridge, D. G., Chalupsky, A. B., & Roberts, A. O. H. A study of selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institute for Research, September 1968.

Hawley, W. D. Horses before carts: Developing adaptive schools and the limits of innovation. In S. Gove & F. Wirt (Eds.), Political science and school politics. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1976.

Hawley, W. D. Policy options for the Emergency School Assistance Act and the Title IV Technical Assistance Programs. Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Education Policy Development Center-Desegregation, July 1981.

Hawley, W. D., & Barry, J. Toward a theoretical understanding of the problems of evaluating and implementing the Emergency School Assistance Act. Unpublished manuscript, Vanderbilt University, Institute for Public Policy Studies, November 1980.

Hawley, W. D., Crain, R., Rossell, C., Fernandez, R., Schofield, J., Smylie, M., Tompkins, R., Trent, W., & Zlotnik, M. Strategies for effective desegregation: A synthesis of findings (Vol. I). In W. D. Hawley (Ed.), Assessment of current knowledge about the effectiveness of school desegregation strategies (Final Report). Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Center for Education and Human Development Policy, 1981.

Hawley, W. D., & Schapira, B. The Title IV Race Desegregation Assistance Centers: Directions for change. Durham, N.C.: Duke University, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Center for Educational Policy, July 1980.

Haywood, H. C. Alternative to normative assessment. In P. Mittler (Ed.), Research to practice in mental retardation: Education and Training, Vol. II, I.A.S.S.M.D., 1977.

Henderson, N. B., Goffeney, B. A., Butler, B. V., & Clarkson, Q. D. Differential rates of school promotion from first grade for white and Negro, male and female 7-year olds. Psychology in the Schools, 1971, 8, 101-109.

Higgins, P. S. The conflict resolution desegregation aides component of the Minneapolis Schools' 1973-74 Emergency School Aid Act project: An evaluation. Minneapolis, Minn.: Minneapolis Public Schools, Department of Research and Evaluation, December 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 117 141)

Hill, P. Do federal education programs interfere with one another? Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, September 1979.

Hillman, S. B., & Davenport, G. C. Teacher-student interactions in desegregated schools. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1978, 70(4), 545-553.

Hinkley, R. H., Beal, R. S., & Breglio, V. J. Student economic and educational status and receipt of educational services (Technical Report No. 3 from the Study of the Sustaining Effects of Compensatory Education on Basic Skills). Santa Ana, Calif.: Decima Research, 1978.

Hunt, J. M., & Kirk, G. E. Criterion-referenced tests of school readiness: A paradigm with illustrations. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1974, 90, 143-182.

Hunter, J., & Schmidt, F. Critical analysis of the statistical and ethnical implications of various definitions of test bias. Psychological Bulletin, 1976, 83, 1053-1071.

Jensen, A. Educational differences. London: Methuen & Company, 1973.

Jensen, A. Test bias and construct validity. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 58, 340-356.

Johnson, R. A. Renewal of school placement systems for the handicapped. In F. Weintraub, A. Abeson, J. Ballard & M. LaVor (Eds.), Public policy and the education of exceptional children. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. Instructional goal structures: Cooperative or individualistic. Review of Educational Research, 1974, 44, 213-240.

Joseph, A. Intelligence, IQ and race--when, how and why they became associated. San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, 1977.

Kaeser, S. Orderly schools that serve all children: A review of successful schools in Ohio. Cleveland, Oh.: Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 181 150) (a)

Kaeser, S. C. Suspensions in school discipline. Education and Urban Society, 1979, 11, 465-486. (b)

Kaufman, A. S. Intelligent testing with the WISC-R. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1979.

Kaufman, M., Agard, J., & Semmel, M. (Eds.). Mainstreaming: Learners and their environments. Baltimore, Md.: University Park Press, 1978.

Killalea Associates, Inc. 1978 elementary and secondary schools civil rights survey: Analysis of selected civil rights issues (Vol. 1): Reports on ranked districts for the nation). Arlington, Va.: Killalea Associates, Inc., July 1978.

Kimbrough, J., & Hill, P. The aggregated effects of federal education programs. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 1981.

Kratochwill, T. R. The movement of psychological extras into ability assessment. Journal of Special Education, 1977, 11, 299-311.

Larkin, J. School desegregation and student suspension: A look at one school system. Education and Urban Society, 1979, 11, 485-495.

Larkins, G. A., & Oldham, S. E. Patterns of racial separation in a desegregated high school. Theory and Research in Social Education, 1976, 4(2), 23-28.

Lawrence, S. Ability grouping in the classroom. Unpublished qualifying paper, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1969.

Leacock, E. B. Teaching and learning in city schools: A comparative study. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Let's look at children. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1975.

Levin, B. School desegregation remedies and the role of social science research. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1978, 42(4), 1-36.

Long, B. H., & Henderson, E. H. The effect of pupils' race, class, test scores, and classroom behavior on the academic expectations of southern and non-southern white teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 063 422)

Lopez, M. Bilingual education and the Latino student. In L. Valverde (Ed.), Bilingual education for Latinos. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1978.

Lowi, T. R. The end of liberalism. New York: Norton Press, 1969.

Lucker, G. W., Rosenfield, D., Sikes, J., & Aronson, E. Performance in the interdependent classroom: A field study. American Educational Research Association, 1976, 13, 123.

Lunn, J. C. Streaming in the primary school. London: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1970.

Mackey, W. F., & Beebe, V. N. Bilingual schools for a bilingual community: Miami's adaptation to the Cuban refugees. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishing, 1977.

Marascuilo, L. A., & McSweeny, M. Tracking and minority student attitudes and performance. Urban Education, 1972, 6, 303-319.

Martinez-Morales, E., & Cook, V. J. Cultural sensitivity and non-discriminatory assessment: Toward a transactional model of assessment for Hispanic children. Unpublished manuscript, Vanderbilt University, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1981.

Mayo, S. T. Measures in education: Mastery learning and mastery testing (A Special Report). East Lansing, Mich.: National Council on Measurement in Education, March 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 151 299)

McLaughlin, M. W. Evaluation and reform: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1975.

McNab, A. G. Project earn and learn: A community involvement approach to improving student behavior. In C. D. Moody, J. Williams & C. B. Vergon (Eds.), Student rights and discipline. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, School of Education, 1978.

McNemar, Q. On so-called test bias. American Psychologist, 1975, 30, 848-851.

Mercer, J. R. Labelling the mentally retarded. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1973.

Mercer, J. R. In defense of racially and culturally non-discriminatory assessment. School Psychology Digest, 1979, 8, 89-115.

Mercer, J. R., & Lewis, J. F. System of multicultural pluralistic assessment. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1978.

Merino, B. J., Politzer, R., & Ramirez, A. The relationship of teachers' Spanish proficiency to pupils' achievement. NABE Journal, 1979, 3(2), 21-37.

Meyers, C. E., Sunstrom, P. E., & Yoshida, R. K. The school psychologist and assessment in special education. School Psychology Monograph, 1974, 2, No. 1.

Meyers, J. Parons, R. D., & Martin, R. Mental health consultation in the schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Mills, R., & Bryan, M. M. Testing . . . grouping: The new segregation in southern schools? Atlanta, Southern Regional Council, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 131 124)

Millsap, P., & Cook, V. J. The effects of race and sex on the examiner-examinee relationship. Working paper, 1980.

Milne, A. Demonstration studies of funds allocation within districts: A report. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, September 19

Morgan, P. R., & McPartland, J. M. The extent of classroom segregation with desegregated schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Narot, R. E. Teacher prejudice and teacher behavior in desegregated schools. In Southern schools: An evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of desegregation. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center,

National Center for Education Statistics. The condition of education: Statistical report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981.

National Center for Policy Review. Special education. Unpublished manuscript Catholic University of America, National Center for Policy Review, 1980.

National Education Association. Ability grouping: Research summary. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1968.

National Institute of Education. Evaluating compensatory education: An interim report on the National Institute of Education compensatory education study. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 132 238)

National Institute of Education. Implications of "follow-the-child" proposals Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, November 1977.

National Institute of Education. In-school alternatives to suspension (Conference report). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, April 1979.

National Public Radio. Pushouts: New outcasts from public school. Transcript of Options in Education (September 9, 1974, GWU-IEL/NPR). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 096 373)

Nazzaro, J. Protection in evaluation procedures. School Psychology Digest, 1977, 6, 31-35.

Nitko, A. J., & Hsu, T. C. Using domain-referenced tests for student placement diagnosis and attainment in a system of adaptive individualized instruction. Educational Technology, 1974, 48-54.

Noblit, G. W. Patience and prudence in a southern high school: Managing the political economy of desegregated education. In R. C. Rist (Ed.), Desegregated schools: Appraisals of an American experiment. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Oakes, J. Tracking and inequality within schools: Findings from a study of schooling. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Reschly, D. J. Nonbiased assessment. In G. D. Phye & D. J. Reschly (Eds.), School psychology: Perspectives and issues. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Rist, R. C. Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. Harvard Educational Review, 1970, 40, 411-451.

Rist, R. The invisible children: School integration in American society. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Rist, R. C. Desegregated schools: Appraisals of an American experiment. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Robinson, J. W., & Preston, J. D. Equal-status contact and modification of racial prejudice: A reexamination of the contact hypothesis. Social Forces, 1976, 54, 911-924.

Rosenholtz, S. J. The multiple abilities curriculum: An intervention against the self-fulfulling prophecy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1977.

Rosenholtz, S. J. Treating problems of academic status. In J. Berger & M. Zelditch, Jr. (Eds.), Status attributions and justice. New York: Elsevier, 1980.

Rossi, R. J., McLaughlin, D. H., Campbell, E. A., & Everett, B. E. Summaries of major Title I evaluations, 1966-1976. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, July 1977.

Rubin, D. P., & David, J. L. The schoolwide projects provision of ESEA Title I: An analysis of the first year of implementation. Palo Alto, Calif.: Bay Area Research Group, April 1981.

Rucker, C. N., & Vincenzo, F. M. Maintaining social acceptance gains made by mentally retarded children. Exceptional Children, 1970, 36, 679-680.

St. John, N. School desegregation: Outcomes for children. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1975.

Salvia, J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Assessment in special and remedial education. Boston: Horighton Mifflin, 1978.

Samuda, R. J. Psychological testing of American minorities: Issues and consequences. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1975.

Sarason, S. B. The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston, Mass.: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.

Sattler, J. M. Assessment of children's intelligence. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1974.

Seidman, H. Politics, position, and power (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Semmel, M. I., Gottlieb, J., & Robinson, N. M. Mainstreaming: Perspectives on educating handicapped children in the public school. In D. C. Berliner (Ed.), Review of research in education (Vol. 3). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association, 1979.

Sharan, S. Cooperative learning in small groups: Research methods and effects on achievement, attitudes and ethnic relations. Review of Educational Research, 1980, 50, 241-272.

Shuey, A. M. The testing of Negro intelligence (2nd ed.). New York: Social Science Press, 1966.

Simon, G. B. Comments on implication of criterion-referenced measurement. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1967, 6, 259-260.

Slavin, R. E. Effects of biracial learning teams on cross-racial friendship and interaction (Report No. 240). Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Social Organization of Schools, 1977. (a)

Slavin, R. E. How student learning teams can integrate the desegregated classroom. Integrated Education, 1977, 15(6), 56-58. (b)

Slavin, R. E. Student learning teams and scores adjusted for past achievement: A summary of field experiments (Report No. 227). Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Social Organization of Schools, 1977. (c)

Slavin, R. E. Student team learning techniques: Narrowing the achievement gap between the races (Technical Report 228). Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Social Organization of Schools, May 1977. (d)

Slavin, R. E. Student teams and achievement divisions: Effects on academic performance, mutual attraction, and attitudes (Report No. 233). Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Social Organization of Schools, 1977. (e)

Slavin, R. E. Using student learning teams to desegregate the classroom. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Social Organization of Schools, July 1977. (f)

Slavin, R. E. Multicultural student team instructional programs and race relations in desegregated schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 1978. (a)

Slavin, R. E. Student teams and achievement divisions. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1978, 12, 39-49. (b)

Slavin, R. E. Effects of biracial learning teams on cross-racial friendships. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 381-387. (a)

Slavin, R. E. Effects of individual learning expectations on student achievement (Report No. 288). Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Social Organization of Schools, November 1979. (b)

Slavin, R. E. Integrating the desegregated classroom: Actions speak louder than words. Educational Leadership, 1979, 36, 322-324. (c)

Slavin, R. E. Student teams and achievement divisions. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1979, 12, 39-49. (d)

Slavin, R. E. Cooperative learning. Review of Educational Research, 1980, 50(2), 315-342. (a)

Slavin, R. E. Cooperative learning in teams: State of the art. Educational Psychologist, 1980, 15, 93-111. (b)

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. School practices that improve race relations. American Educational Research Journal, 1979, 16, 169-180.

Smith, S. M. An assessment of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) programs operations: Policy recommendations (Vol. 3). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Applied Urbanetics, September 1978.

Smylie, M. A., & Hawley, W. D. Increasing the effectiveness of inservice training in desegregated schools: A synthesis of current research. Nashville, Tenn.: Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, May 1981.

Solomon, D., & Kendall, A. Teachers' perceptions of and reactions to misbehavior in traditional and open classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67, 528-530.

Southern Regional Council. A conflict of cultures. Southern Exposure, 1979, 7(2), 126-128.

Southern Regional Council and the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial. The student pushout: Victim of continued resistance to desegregation. Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Council, 1973.

Stanfield, R. L. Are federal bilingual rules a foot in the schoolhouse door? National Journal, October 18, 1980, pp. 1736-1740.

Stearns, M. S., Green, D., & David, J. L. Local implementation of P.L. 94-142: First year report of a longitudinal study. Menlo Park, Calif.: SRI International, Education Research Center, April 1980.

Stulac, J. The self-fulfilling prophecy: Modifying the effects of a unidimensional perception of academic competence in task-oriented groups. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.

Talley, R. C. Evaluating the effects of implementing the system of multicultural pluralistic assessment: A qualitative perspective. School Psychology Digest, 1979, 8, 71-80.

Thernstrom, A. M. E pluribus plura - Congress and bilingual education. Public Interest, 1980, 60, 3-22.

Thiemann, F. C., & Deflaminis, J. A. Necessity's sharp pinch: Title I under conditions of merger and desegregation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 1978.

Thorndike, R. L., & Hagen, E. Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education (4th ed.). New York: Wiley & Sons, 1977.

Tobin, A., & Bonner, J. Elementary mathematics resource teacher program. Arithmetic Teacher, 1977, 24, 329-332.

Tompkins, R. Preparing communities for school desegregation. Theory Into Practice, 1978, 2, 107-114.

Trent, W. T. Expert opinion on school desegregation issues: Findings from the interviews. In W. D. Hawley (Ed.), Assessment of current knowledge about the effectiveness of school desegregation strategies (Vol. VI). Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Center for Education and Human Development Policy, 1981.

Troike, R. Research evidence for the effectiveness of bilingual education. NABE Journal, 1978, 3(1), 13-24.

Tucker, J. A. Operationalizing the diagnostic-intervention process. In T. Oakland (Ed.), Psychological and educational assessment of minority children. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1977.

Tuckman, B. W., & Bierman, M. Beyond Pygmalion: Galatea in the schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, February 1971.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current population reports, school enrollment-social and economic characteristics of students, October 1975, Series P-20, No. 294. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Five communities: Their search for equal education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Toward quality education for Mexican Americans (Report 6: Mexican American Education Study). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Fulfilling the letter and spirit of the law: Desegregation of the nation's public schools. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

U.S. Office of Education. Working together: Case studies of Title I ESEA programs in four desegregated school districts. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Van Fleet, A. A. Children out of school in Ohio. Cleveland, Oh.: Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools, 1977.

Vazquez, J. A. Bilingual education's greatest potential: Enrichment for all. NABE Journal, 1976, 1(1), 23-26.

Wadsworth, B. J. Piaget for the classroom teacher. New York: Longman, 1978.

Waggoner, D. Teacher resources in bilingual education: A national survey. NABE Journal, 1979, 3(2), 53-60.

Wallace, G., & Larsen, S. C. Educational assessment of learning problems: Testing for teaching. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1978.

Walline, J. Solving student problems in the house system. NASSP Bulletin, 1976, 60, 30-37.

Walsh, M. A. The development of a rationale for a program to prepare teachers for Spanish-speaking children in the bilingual-bicultural elementary school. San Francisco: R & E Research Association, 1976.

Wang, M. C. Implications for effective use of instruction and learning. Educational Horizons, 1979, 57, 169-174. (a)

Wang, M. C. Maximizing the effective use of school time by teachers and students. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 1979, 4, 187-201. (b)

Watkins, S. Staff Psychologist and Coordinator for Emergency Aid Assistance Grant, Omaha Public Schools. Personal communication, May 7, 1980.

Weatherly, R. L. Reforming special education: Policy implementation from state level to street level. Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1979.

Weigel, R. H., Wiser, P. L., & Cook, S. W. The impact of cooperative learning experiences on cross-ethnic relations and attitudes. Journal of Social Issues, 1975, 31(1), 219-245.

Weinberg, M. Minority students: A research appraisal (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1977.

Weintraub, F. J., & Abeson, A. New education policies for the handicapped: The quiet revolution. In F. J. Weintraub, A. Abeson, J. Ballard & M. L. LaVor (Eds.), Public policy and the education of exceptional children. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.

Wellisch, J. B. Characteristics and contexts of ESAA basic human relations programs. Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corporation, 1979.

Wennersten, J. R. Preparing teachers for the realities of desegregation and integration. Education, 1974, 94, 269-272.

Williams, R. The BITCH-100: A culture-specific test. Journal of Afro-American Issues, 1975, 3, 103-116.

Wulfsberg, R. M. Testimony before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives (September 1980).

Wynn, C. Black and white Bibb county classrooms. Integrated Education, 1971, 8(4), 10-16.

Yoshida, R. K., Fenton, K. S., Maxwell, J. P., & Kaufman, M. J. Group decision making in the planning team process: Myth or reality? Journal of School Psychology, 1978, 16, 237-244.

Yoshida, R., MacMillan, D. L., & Meyers, C. E. The decertification of minority group EMR students in California: Student achievement and adjustment. In R. L. Johnes (Ed.), Mainstreaming and the minority child. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota, Leadership Training Institute/Special Education, 1976.